STO ACPL ITEM
DISCARDED

283.42 W43ch
Weir 1867711

Church and the age

STORAGE

M. L.

DO NOT REMOVE
CARDS FROM POCKET

PUBLIC LIBRARY
FORT WAYNE AND ALLEN COUNTY, IND.

ACPL ITEM
DISCARDED

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2022 with funding from
Kahle/Austin Foundation

https://archive.org/details/churchage02edarch

THE CHURCH AND THE AGE:

ESSAYS ON THE

PRINCIPLES AND PRESENT POSITION OF THE ANGLICAN CHURCH.

EDITED BY

ARCHIBALD WEIR, D.C.L.,
VICAR OF FORTY HILL, ENFIELD;

AND

WILLIAM DALRYMPLE MACLAGAN, M.A.,
RECTOR OF NEWINGTON, SURREY.

SECOND EDITION.

LONDON:
JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET.
1870.

The right of Translation is reserved.

1867711

THE CHURCH AND THE AGE.

UNIFORM WITH THE PRESENT VOLUME.

PRINCIPLES AT STAKE. Essays on Church Questions of the Present Day. Edited by GEORGE HENRY SUMNER, M.A. Rector of Old Alresford. 8vo., 12*s.*

Contents:—

Ritualism and Uniformity.—Benjamin Shaw, M.A.
Increase of the Episcopate.—Bishop of Bath and Wells.
Powers and Duties of the Priesthood.—Canon Payne Smith.
National Education.—Rev. Alex. R. Grant.
Doctrine of the Eucharist.—Rev. G. H. Sumner.
Scripture and Ritual.—Canon T. D. Bernard.
The Church in South Africa.—Arthur Mills, M.A.
Schismatical Tendency of Ritualism.—Rev. Dr. Salmon.
Revisions of the Liturgy.—Rev. W. G. Humphry.
Parties and Party Spirit.—Dean of Chester.

AIDS TO FAITH: A Series of Theological Essays. Edited by WM. THOMSON, D.D., Lord Archbishop of York. 8vo., 9*s.*

Contents:—

Miracles.—Dean of St. Paul's.
Evidences of Christianity.—Bishop of Killaloe.
Prophecy—and the Mosaic Record of Creation.—Rev. Dr. M'Caul.
Ideology and Subscription.—Canon F. C. Cook.
The Pentateuch.—Rev. George Rawlinson.
Inspiration.—Bishop of Ely.
Death of Christ.—Archbishop of York.
Scripture and its Interpretation.—Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol.

40234

LONDON: PRINTED BY WILLIAM CLOWES AND SONS, STAMFORD STREET,
AND CHARING CROSS.

NOTICE.

The object of this Volume is to illustrate the position of the Anglican Communion as a Reformed Branch of the Catholic Church, and to vindicate her power of self-adaptation to the intellectual and social conditions of the Age, without sacrificing her primitive principles of Evangelical Truth and Apostolical Order.

Beyond a general concurrence in this object, each author has written in perfect independence, and without knowing the contents of the Essays of the other writers. Each is responsible for his own contribution, and for that alone.

A. W.
W. D. M.

Epiphany, 1870.

CONTENTS.

INTRODUCTION.

PAGE

ANGLICAN PRINCIPLES 1

By Walter Farquhar Hook, D.D., F.R.S., Dean of Chichester.

ESSAY I.

THE COURSE AND DIRECTION OF MODERN RELIGIOUS THOUGHT 39

By Charles John Ellicott, D.D., Lord Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol.

ESSAY II.

THE STATE, THE CHURCH, AND THE SYNODS OF THE FUTURE 89

By William J. Irons, D.D. Oxon., Prebendary of St. Paul's, and Rector of Wadingham.

ESSAY III.

THE RELIGIOUS USE OF TASTE 125

By Richard St. John Tyrwhitt, M.A., Vicar of S. Mary Magdalen with S. George-the-Martyr, Oxford; formerly Student of Christ Church.

ESSAY IV.

THE PLACE OF THE LAITY IN CHURCH GOVERNMENT 161

By Montagu Burrows, R.N., M.A., Fellow of All Souls, and Chichele Professor of Modern History in the University of Oxford.

ESSAY V.

PAGE

PRIVATE LIFE AND MINISTRATIONS OF THE PARISH PRIEST 201

By WILLIAM WALSHAM HOW, M.A., Rector of Whittington, Shropshire; Hon. Canon of S. Asaph.

ESSAY VI.

ENGLISH DIVINES OF THE SIXTEENTH AND SEVENTEENTH CENTURIES 225

By ARTHUR WEST HADDAN, B.D., Rector of Barton-on-the-Heath; Hon. Canon of Worcester; and formerly Fellow of Trinity College, Oxford.

ESSAY VII.

LITURGIES AND RITUAL 261

By MICHAEL F. SADLER, M.A., Prebendary of Wells, and Rector of Honiton.

ESSAY VIII.

INDIAN MISSIONS 315

By SIR BARTLE FRERE, G.C.S.I., K.C.B., D.C.L.

ESSAY IX.

THE CHURCH AND EDUCATION 381

By ALFRED BARRY, D.D., D.C.L., Oxon.; Principal of King's College, London; Examining Chaplain to the Lord Bishop of Bath and Wells; and formerly Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge.

ESSAY X.

THE CHURCH AND THE PEOPLE 423

By WILLIAM DALRYMPLE MACLAGAN, M.A., Rector of Newington, Surrey.

ESSAY XI.

CONCILIATION AND COMPREHENSION: CHARITY WITHIN THE CHURCH AND BEYOND 467

By ARCHIBALD WEIR, D.C.L., Vicar of Forty Hill, Enfield.

INTRODUCTION.

ANGLICAN PRINCIPLES.

By WALTER FARQUHAR HOOK, D.D., F.R.S.,
Dean of Chichester.

CONTENTS OF INTRODUCTION.

Differences of opinion consistent with sameness of principles.

Distinction between prejudice and principle. Uses of prejudice.

Principles fixed opinions, by which other opinions are tested.

The writers of these Essays, differing in their opinions, are united in accepting the principles of the English Reformation.

The principles of the English Reformers stated. Those principles entirely distinct from the principles of the foreign Reformers.

Deference to the Primitive Church while rejecting Mediaevalism. On what grounds.

The *traditio exegetica* of the Primitive Church.

The formularies of the Church of England Catholic. Understood in a non-natural sense by Puritans.

Their right to place their own construction on the formularies admitted in courts of law.

The same license claimed by Tractarians and Ritualists.

Also claimed by Freethinkers.

Difficult to say how far this license of interpretation may extend.

Wisdom of ascertaining the principles of authors before reading their works.

INTRODUCTION.—ANGLICAN PRINCIPLES.

ALTHOUGH the writers of the following Essays may not, on all points, concur in their opinions, whether those opinions have reference to dogma, to ecclesiastical discipline, or even to fact, the result of their labours is not presented to the reader in the shape of unconnected disquisitions, for the authors are associated under the influence of a common principle.

It is important, in these days, to bear in mind that, by the recognition of a common principle, a diversity of opinion is not excluded; and we deny that any impediment is offered to freedom of inquiry, or to intellectual progress, by a refusal to examine each paradoxical speculation with which the public mind may from time to time be astonished or amused. We are not bound to tilt with every doughty champion who may summon us into the lists of controversy; and even if the paradox be propounded by a man of mark, it is not necessarily a sign of narrowness of mind on our part if we decline to investigate his lucubrations.

It is undoubtedly true, that through the progress of events and from personal experience, new ideas are often realised to the mind, and that these may lead to the modification of foregone conclusions, and sometimes to the entire renunciation of what we at one time resolutely maintained. Except when a suspicion arises of the intervention of some sordid or selfish motive, I am not aware that a severe censure is often pronounced on the man who admits that he has changed his opinions, provided that for the change he assigns a sufficient reason. No one is infallible. Nevertheless, a definite meaning must be attached to the apostolic injunction: "Be not carried about with divers and strange doctrines;" and we reiterate the exhortation, *Principiis obsta.*

Opinions may be divided into two great classes. The great majority of the opinions that direct our conduct and shape our walk in life are simply prejudices. The word prejudice is

unfortunately, in common parlance, used generally in a bad sense, to signify such an unreasonable prepossession against a person or thing as to blind our judgment. But if we advert to the etymology of the word, and to its use by some of our best writers, it may be employed, indifferently and according to circumstances, either in a good sense or a bad: for it simply means a judgment that has been accepted without previous inquiry or examination. An opinion on any given subject may be to us a prejudice, that is to say, it may be accepted without examination; but it does not follow that, on this account, the opinion must be erroneous.

We may venture to surmise, that a belief in the Copernican system of the earth's revolution round the sun is, as regards the vast majority of those who have never entertained a doubt upon the subject, a prejudice, and nothing more. In the everyday concerns of life, if we declined to act upon our prejudices, we should abstain from action altogether.

It is not by Reason alone that we obtain our knowledge, in things secular; and why should we expect it to be otherwise in what pertains to religion and the wellbeing of our souls? If we were guided by reason alone, why should there be such differences, such antagonisms, not only between one man and another, but between whole communities of men? Why should one whole nation, with a few exceptions, be Protestant, while in another nation the errors denounced by the Protestant are cherished as truths, for the maintenance of which men would die themselves, and for denying which they would doom others to death? Before the separation of the British Plantations in North America from the mother country, a North American colonist was scarcely distinguishable from a British subject residing in England; between a native of Australia and a native of England, at the present time, there is not more difference than there is between an inhabitant of Yorkshire and one born within the sound of Bow Bells. But now, when the Plantations have been formed into the United States, the Americans have become foreigners to us and we foreigners to them. The reason of this is obvious. We are, to a considerable extent, what our national and domestic institutions make us; and when their institutions became different from those of the mother country, the citizens of the great Republic were

seen in successive generations to differ more and more from their European brethren in manners, in their habits of thought, and, if not in sentiment, yet in the taste by which it is uttered or expressed.

To an intuitive perception of the influence of prejudice we may trace many of the unhappy controversies by which our country is distracted; and this has especial reference to the controversies bearing upon the education of the people. The real objection to the system of education adopted by the National Society is, that it is designed to prejudice the minds of the young, and to train them as enlightened members of the Church of England; and it is not to be denied, that it is for this purpose—to prejudice the minds of the rising generation, and to instil what is believed to be the truth into their minds—that the clergy of the Church of England feel it to be their duty, by many self-denials and much exertion—to erect national schools in parishes, where, except for those self-denials and exertions, no schools would exist. It is, at the same time, admitted by the Nonconformists that they are diligent in their Sunday schools under a similar impression, that it is their duty to prejudice as many minds as they can in favour of their respective sects. The very infidel, in eliminating religion from education, is, under evil influence, endeavouring to prejudice the national mind against all religion; for easy, almost imperceptible, is the descent from non-religion to irreligion; and of all persecutors the most intolerant is the infidel.

Even when not acknowledged, it is tacitly admitted, that we are really educated through the secret influence of the domestic and national institutions in the midst of which we have advanced from childhood to youth, and passed from youth to man's estate; by the example of associates and compatriots, and by habits actually formed before reason has dawned: in short, we need not deny that man is the creature of circumstances, provided we add, that this is only true to a certain point.

It is useless to say, that this ought not to be, or that a reasonable being should be guided by reason alone; for, whether it be right or wrong, the fact is as we have stated it, and we must make the best of it. Tradition is the raw material on which reason has to work. We receive our knowledge, secular and religious, in the first instance by tradition; and knowledge,

however obtained, is to be handed down from father to son. This is a fact not only written by the finger of God on the external world, it is a fact recognised in the Scriptures of truth. Abraham, for example, was selected to be the father of the faithful, and why? "I know him," saith the Lord, "that he will command his children, and his household after him, and they shall keep the way of the Lord."* In other words, he would do what every man ought to do: having received the truth, he would make provision for its being handed on from generation to generation.

The same Divine principle, if we may use the expression, is observable in the selection of one nation out of all the families of mankind, in order that a nation might be prepared for the reception of the Messiah when He should become incarnate. The Lord surrounded that nation with institutions, and bound them by ordinances, which were for ever reminding them of the advent of Him, through whom all the nations of the earth would be blessed; so that if a disobedient people, who were commanded to speak of the Divine mercies to their children, "should hold their peace, the very stones would immediately cry out."

We frequently find, in the ways of Divine Providence, that what the believer does as an act of duty, verily receiving his reward, unbelievers are compelled to do by the force of circumstances.

We have before remarked, that because an opinion may, in any given case, be merely a prejudice, it does not follow that it must be erroneous. The probability is, that what we have received from wise and good men is true. But, on the other hand, if any evil—we may go further, and say, if any inconvenient—results are deducible from an inherited opinion, if the opinion leads logically to the justification of conduct of questionable morality, we are always justified—and we are sometimes bound in duty—to subject that opinion, however dearly cherished or long-sustained, to a severe examination; and either entirely to reject it, or to subject it to those modifications by the overlooking of which, what was intended to be a blessing may have been turned into a curse.

---

* Genesis xviii. 19.

We are, at such times and under such circumstances, to bring the whole force of the mind to bear upon the case under consideration: the subject is to be contemplated in its various aspects, in all its bearings, and in every phase: it may be necessary to consult those learned men or their works, who have pursued a similar investigation.

And now the opinion is no longer a prejudice; it has become a principle. By a principle we mean an opinion formed after a minute enquiry and investigation, such as we have just described. A principle is a fixed opinion, a fundamental truth, a rule, an axiom, a propositio praemissa: it is an unalterable opinion, by which all other opinions, all the prejudices, in their nature changeable, are to be tested; it is a standard by which to measure, it is a plummet by which to fathom every opinion suggested to the mind, or which a wayward mind may, in thinking, evolve.

On these grounds, we reiterate the assertion, that we may refuse to read any work the professed object of which is opposed to our *principles,* unless we are officially called upon to refute it; for bigotry does not consist in a firm adherence to our principles, but simply in an inconsiderate and uncharitable enforcement of our prejudices. To suffer for our prejudices may be mere obstinacy, but for our principles we should be prepared to die.

We may proceed yet farther: we have produced a reason to be assigned, when we are misrepresented as unenlightened bigots, for declining to peruse every modern production of literature which may bear on our own line of thought; we may add, that it may be an act of prudence in the cause of truth, if we refuse to re-enter a field of controversy from which we have long retired. The time may come, when all that we remember is, that we were, at one period of life, after painful study, completely satisfied in regard to certain conclusions upon an important subject: after a lapse of years, many of the arguments which convinced us at the time, may have passed irrevocably from the mind; and after a still further lapse of time, we may have become conscious that our intellectual powers are no longer what they were, or that the enthusiasm is lacking which is often requisite to set fire to a train of thought. It may be, that we are compelled by circumstances once more to descend

into the arena of polemics; but this is a distinct question, and the old man may rather speak with authority, than engage in disputation. He may fairly say: This subject was examined by me in the vigour of my faculties; I was fully persuaded; I abide by the results of my investigations. I will give you the books that I consulted, I will discourse with you on the subject; but it is for a younger generation to fight. I will only stand by, and lift up my hands in prayer.

Again, there may be topics brought upon the tapis, that may have only an indirect reference to certain principles which we have stored away in the closet of our memory. Now, on any one of these subjects, we may refer to a principle already mastered, as the touchstone by which we may at once decide where, when, and how far, what is new to us is worthy of our serious attention. As the chemist, by the application of certain tests, can detect in food, apparently wholesome, the existence of poison, so a learned divine, by the adduction of his Principle, can discover at once those particles of heresy which vitiate a literary production, otherwise adapted to the literary appetite of the age.

We may illustrate our position by a reference to that great dogma which every enlightened Christian sees to lie at the foundation of every doctrine in the Christian Church. I allude to the doctrine of the Holy Trinity. This fundamental verity is handed down to us by the Church, to be again handed down by each father of the faithful, to his children, and by them to generations yet unborn. Adverting to a position already taken, we may have received it *directly* from our parents, from our nurses, from our pastors and masters, and *indirectly* from every institution of our holy religion—that is, we may have received it by tradition.

We may, however, have been obliged to examine into the truth of this dogma; and, proceeding from our immediate instructors to the great Authority Himself, we have ascertained the revealed fact, that there is but one Living and True God, Everlasting, without body, parts or passions, of infinite power, wisdom and goodness, the maker and preserver of all things both visible and invisible; and in Unity of this Godhead there be three Persons, of one Substance, Power and Eternity, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost.

This has now become to us a Principle. If we are not engaged in the ministry—when it may be our duty to assist those who are converting their prejudices into principles—we are acting as reasonable beings, when we say: Having a fixed opinion, a Principle, in relation to this dogma,, I at once lay aside, as useless to me, any work which avowedly oppugns my Principle, or would send me back to the school in which m degree shows that I was able, at one period of my life, to pass that examination, to which if I were *now* to submit, I should be found, though still a scholar, to be deficient in details.

An anecdote is somewhere related of old Hugh Latimer, which illustrates our position. Whatever may have been the old humourist's defects, he was evidently, at one time, a good scholar, and indisputably he possessed a clear and powerful intellect, with an amount of practical common sense which at times almost amounted to genius. He stood in his old age before his prosecutors. They proposed to cross-examine him, and especially directed their attention to that point which was then adopted by all parties as the test of orthodoxy or its reverse. They challenged him to a discussion on the subject of Transubstantiation. The "old man eloquent" replied to this effect: "When I was young, in the full possession of my faculties, with books to consult and learned friends with whom to take sweet counsel, I examined this subject, and I rejected the figment of Transubstantiation, which cannot be proved by Scripture and was unknown to the Catholic Church for nearly a thousand years. And now, an old man worn out by sufferings, deprived of my books and excluded from my friends, I am not going to damage the cause of truth by entering into an unequal contest with adversaries in possession of all the advantages which once were mine, but now are denied me. I examined, I studied, I prayed, I was convinced; for my convictions I am not prepared to argue, but I am quite ready to die."

Well would it be, if some among those who have "fallen away" to the Freethinkers, unhappily active among us, would call to mind their studies, when, in former times, they were distinguished among their contemporaries for their maintenance of those great truths to which they now stand indifferent, if not opposed. Although arguments may have been forgotten and prejudices on the subject removed, yet an abnegation of a

Principle, unless the whole subject on which it bears be again most carefully examined, is an acknowledgment of incapacity in times past, or evinces a culpable weakness under circumstances of present temptation. To mistake a prejudice for a principle is folly: to renounce a principle for the purpose of obtaining a worldly object, or of saving even life itself, is the indication of a dishonest mind. Such conduct, alas! in these latter days, has become so common, that these remarks are divested of even the shadow of personality; but the existence of the fact justifies the remark.

If, after making the distinction between Principle and Prejudice, we refer to the principle which unites the writers in this volume, while within the limits of that principle there may be many divergencies of opinion; we may mention at once, that the bond of union is a determination to abide by those principles which have distinguished the English from all other Reformers, from the reign of Henry VIII. to the time of the Revolution, since which time the Church of England has remained stationary. Having examined the principles by which the great men were actuated, by whom the Church in this country was gradually reformed, they adopt those principles as their own, and apply them, as far as may be, to the exigencies of the existing Church, and to the demand now made for a further Reform.

Now in referring to the Reformation of our Church, we must never forget, that our Reformation was not one revolutionary act, but a series of events, covering the space of a century and a half. We find the persons who, during that space of time, had the conduct of ecclesiastical affairs in this country, proceeding on certain principles, and adhering to them, in spite of a powerful opposition, and the demand of the worldly, that they should prophesy smooth things, and sacrifice the true to the expedient.

One of the advantages which, as Anglicans, we possess is this, that we call no man master. The Lutheran is silenced when the authority of Martin Luther is quoted against him; and in all parts of the civilised world, John Calvin is to many, what the Master of the Sentences was to the student of Divinity in the middle age.

The members of the Church of England accept the opinion of no individual as authoritative. Hence an inclination is mani-

fested by our Divines to depreciate the character rather than to exaggerate the merits of the men engaged in our Reformation. Cranmer is no more to us than his illustrious predecessor, Thomas à Becket. Both were primates of the same church. Both were zealous but often mistaken men. It was gradually, not by one man, but by a succession of men, and out of elements the most discordant and heterogeneous, that, under God's Providence, our Reformation was effected.

Men, immoral and irreligious, such as Henry VIII., Thomas Cromwell, and some among the counsellors of Edward and the courtiers of Elizabeth, with the mobs they led and the aristocrats they bribed, were overruled by God's mercy to accomplish ends which they neither desired nor designed.

Here we may remark, what the Scriptures abundantly show, that even when the trial of a man as *a person*—as a conscious agent—has terminated, he may still be preserved on earth, as *a thing* to be employed, like the insensible elements, in effecting the Divine purpose, for the accomplishment of the work to which he was predestined at his birth. Pharaoh, King of Egypt, was a person invested with unusual power; and "having the power to let Israel go," he was commanded to exercise it to that effect. Had he, as a *person* obeyed, verily he would have had his reward. When he persevered in disobedience his trial as a person was finished, but not so his life. He did not go immediately to his own place in the other world; with a heart judicially hardened, he was continued on earth until, against his will, he was compelled to be the *thing* through which Israel was delivered.

We would, however, guard against misapprehension, by observing, that when we speak of Divine Providence, we do not, under the Christian Dispensation, refer to Divine Guidance; we refer only to that overruling of the Sovereign Disposer of all things which thoughtful men are careful to notice in profane history as well as in sacred. Through all the difficulties of a Revolutionary age, the Reformation of the English Church worked its way; and what, at the time, was regarded as a misfortune, the absence, namely, of any master mind, is now our boast. In very deed, the English Churchman is

> "Nullius addictus jurare in verba magistri."

And, with some modifications, the Reformers could have added—

> "Quo me cunque rapit tempestas deferor hospes."

They were prepared to yield to external pressure when, in yielding, they sacrificed no principle; and their restraining principle was not what any individual, however pious and learned, may have opined, but what the Church, when undivided, had authoritatively ruled.

Their first grand principle related to the continuity of the Church. A belief in the continuity of the Church, that the post-Reformation is only a development of the pre-Reformation Church, was the distinguishing point between the English and the foreign Reformers; and it is the mark of distinction still between the Church of England and Dissenters, whether Romish or Protestant,—the two last-mentioned parties deriving their doctrine and discipline from foreign sources, and taking the foreigner, Calvin or the Pope, for their authority.

In strictness of speech, the title of Reformer, as applied to Luther, Zwingli, or Calvin, is a misnomer; and they only retain it by the courtesy of Divines and the ignorance of people in general. Such concessions are always mischievous; for a single word may imply an argument, or at all events a foregone conclusion. The Romanists, for example, are permitted by the careless, the malignant, or the ignorant, to assume the title of Catholic, although any one of competent learning is aware that this title insinuates the falsehood that every Church not of the Roman obedience is heretical.*

By a reform, strictly speaking, is meant the correction of abuses which prevail in some pre-existing Institution.

Luther's desire at first was, no doubt, to reform the Church in Saxony; when he found, that he could not succeed in his attempt

---

* "Although the word καθυλικὸς properly signifies universal, yet they [the ancient fathers] commonly used it in the same sense as we do the word orthodox, as opposed to a heretic, calling an orthodox man a Catholic, that is, a son of the Catholic Church; as taking it for granted, that they, and they only, which constantly adhere to the doctrine of the Catholic or Universal Church, are truly orthodox; which they could not do unless they had believed the Catholic Church to be so. And besides that, it is part of our very creed, that the Catholic Church is holy, which she could not be, except free from heresy, as directly opposite to true holiness."—Bp. Beveridge's *Works*, ii. 197. A Catholic, in the primitive Church, was one who accepted in the interpretation of Scripture the tradition of the Church Universal. He was opposed to the Heretic, who, as the word αἵρεσις imports, instead of deferring to the Church, exercised, in regard to any dogma or practice, his private judgment. The right of Private Judgment is a tenet of Protestants from Luther to Socinus—and for a Protestant to call any one whose private judgment differs from his own a heretic, is sinful, because it can only be done for the purpose of giving pain. In the mouth of a Catholic the word has a definite meaning.

so rapidly as he expected or desired, he gradually formed a sect, of which, as we have before observed, he was himself the apostle. It does not appear that he intended or desired that this should be a permanent arrangement; like John Wesley in his better days, he made a temporary arrangement for his followers, anticipating the time when they would again be admitted into the Church. Hence among English Reformers there was always more sympathy with Luther than with Calvin. Luther merely set the Church aside for a season. Calvin, on the contrary, evidently determined, from the commencement of his career, to be the founder of a new Church—that is, of a sect—of which he and his successors were to occupy the position of a pope. He was himself a Protestant Hildebrand. His great and powerful mind devised, at an early period of life, one of the most wonderful productions of the human intellect, rendered the more remarkable when we consider the comparative youth of the author, and the circumstances of the age in which he lived. He did not attempt to reform: his object was to destroy the old, and to establish something new. He took the ancient parchment, and, having erased or attempted to erase what had been inscribed thereon, in order that his own writing might be received, he presented us with a palimpsest. In the writings of Luther, we find that writer always happy when his private judgment accorded with the teaching of the Church, and he referred with deference and respect to the ancient writers and Divines. Not so Calvin: so far from regarding the Church as a Divine Institution, he found pleasure in cavilling at the theological terminology adopted by the Church, even when it would seem that he accepted the dogma if otherwise expressed. To such an extent did he carry this feeling, that the judge who pronounced sentence of death on Servetus and found fault with himself for too much leniency in his government, was himself suspected of holding erroneous opinions on the fundamental verity of our holy religion—the doctrine of the Trinity.*

---

* Bishop Bull is very strong on this subject; his words are, "Certe ipsa synodus Nicæna decrevit, Filium esse Deum de Deo; qui vero Deus de Deo est, dici non potest a seipso Deus sine manifesta contradictione. Sed quorsum ego Nicæna synodi auctoritate constringere eos annitar, qui synodi illius auctoritatem ne flocci quidem facere videntur? Nam primipilus et antesignanus eorum, qui istam sententiam propugnarunt, non veritus est sanctissimos et venerandos Nicæni concilii Patres *fanaticos* appellare, et formulam Confes-

Upon this point, however, it is not my purpose to dwell. We have only to remark, that he was avowedly the founder of a new sect, and was not, in strictness of speech, a Reformer.

These observations are not made in a captious or pedantic spirit, or in the vain hope of depriving the illustrious men to whom reference has been made, of the title they enjoy, and will continue to enjoy till time shall be no more. The object is simply to impress upon the reader's attention the obvious but too often forgotten fact, that a Reformation, strictly speaking, implies the previous existence of something to be reformed; and that the work of the Continental Reformers—to concede to them their title—was not Reformation, but Revolution. Men may be divided in their opinion as to the merit or demerit of their proceedings, but the fact remains the same. They each of them offered to the people what is still offered to their descendants—a sect.

While Luther and Calvin, supported by those who, disgusted by the iniquities of the dominant ecclesiastical system, and by men, many of them, scarcely inferior in genius and learning to the great leaders themselves, were revolutionising religion and creating new sects in Germany and Switzerland,—the English divines, their inferiors in all that constitutes genius, but endowed with an unusual share of common sense, were carrying on steadily and amid difficulties resulting from the teaching and sometimes the interference of the foreigner, the reform of the old Catholic Church in England, into which they had been baptized, and from which they were determined not to depart. They did for the Church what has been effected by statesmen for the realm.

We have passing before our eyes events illustrative of the position here assumed. During the last ninety years what wonderful changes have taken place in France—changes which have constituted, by the admission of all parties, not a Reformation, but a Revolution; not the correction of the old, but the

---

sionis illorum, 'Deum de Deo, lumen de lumine, Deum verum de Deo vero,' *duram* vocare, in qua manifesta sit βαττολογία, quin et carmen potius cantilando aptum, quam confessionis formulam. Horresco hæc referens, adeoque piam et studiosam juventutem serio hortor, ut a spiritu sibi caveat, ex quo talia profecta fuerint. Multum quidem debemus viro illi, ob operam egregiam in purganda ecclesia Christi a papisticis superstitionibus navatam; absit tamen, ut pro magistro illum habeamus, aut in verba ejus juremus, aut denique errores ejus manifestos, et novitia placita, a catholico consensu abeuntia, libere, ubi res postulaverit notare reformidemus."—*Works*, vi. 697.

establishment of a new order of things. The part in the French Constitution admitted to be vicious has not been remodelled: it has been obliterated. The dynasty has been changed, and an adventurer has planted a new throne in the palace occupied for centuries by a succession of hereditary princes, whose living descendants are now in exile. The ancient laws have been superseded by the Code Napoleon. What was at one time a kingdom has become an empire.

If we look to the contemporary history of England, changes in the condition of our country almost as momentous have taken place; but they have occurred without bloodshed, and simply by adapting the ancient laws and the constitutional principles of the country to the requirements of modern society and the advancement of civilisation and knowledge. We have still the Three Estates of the Realm, the Lords Spiritual, the Lords Temporal, and the Commons in Parliament assembled. We have still a Sovereign seated on the Throne occupied by her ancestors up to the time of Cerdic. Although the authority of the Sovereign has been restricted—although both Houses of Parliament have been subjected to many and great reforms—yet it is of Old England still that an Englishman makes his boast, and in the history of the past he delights to detect the germ of his present liberties, and of the predominance of England throughout the world.

So has it been with the English Church. We inherited a Church which, like the State, was not free from error; and what was erroneous, being gradually discovered, has been gradually removed, while mediæval innovations have been made to give way to primitive truth. Our Reformers found their Holy Mother the Church sick nigh unto death; they administered to her the healing medicine and the wholesome food which she required; and we glory in the fact that we trace our orders down from Augustine, as he from the Apostles. The present Primate of all England is the ninety-second Archbishop of Canterbury, and, in the words of Bishop Bull, we say: "The Church of England in her reformation affected no unnecessary change or innovation, but of those things that were themselves manifest changes and innovations, yea, somewhat worse; such as image-worship, the worship and invocation of saints and angels, the dry communion, the senseless and unreasonable service of God

in an unknown tongue, enjoined on the people, and not understood by them. Wherein, as I have already shewn, every man's reason and conscience will tell him that the change is made for the better. She hath also shaken off (and it was high time so to do, seeing that St. Augustin so long ago complained of it) that intolerable yoke of ceremonies, many of which were perfectly insignificant and ridiculous, some directly sinful, and their number in the whole so great as to require that intention of mind which ought to be employed about more weighty and important matters. Yet retaining still (to shew that she was not over-nice and scrupulous) some few ceremonies, that had on them the stamp of venerable antiquity, or otherwise recommended themselves by their decency and fitness. In a word, the authors of our Reformation dealt with our Church as they did with our temples or material churches. They did not pull them down and raise new structures in their places, no, nor so much as new consecrate the old ones; but only removed the objects and occasions of idolatrous worship (at least out of the more open and conspicuous places), and took away some little superstitious trinkets, in other things leaving them as they found them, and freely and without scruple making use of them." * In the assertion of these principles the Reformation commenced.

In the 'Institutes of a Christian Man,' it is said, in reference to the ninth article of the Creed, "I believe that the particular churches" [the various national or provincial churches which had before been named], "in what place of the world soever they be congregated, be the very parts, portions, or members of this Catholic and Universal Church; and that between them there is indeed no difference in superiority, pre-eminence, or authority, neither that any one of them is head or sovereign; and be all grounded and builded upon one foundation, and be all called unto like and unto the same purity, cleanness, honour and glory; and be all subject unto one God, one Lord, one head Jesu Christ; and be all governed with one Holy Spirit. And, therefore, I do believe that the Church of Rome is not, nor cannot worthily be called the Catholic Church, but only a particular member thereof; and cannot challenge or vindicate

---

* Bull's 'Works,' ii. 209.

of right, and by the Word of God, to be head of this Universal Church, or to have any superiority over the other churches of Christ which be in England, France, Spain, or in any other realm; but that they be all free from any subjection unto the said Church of Rome, or unto the minister or bishop of the same.

"And I believe also that the said Church of Rome, with all the other particular churches in the world, compacted and united together do make and constitute but one Catholic Church or body. And that, like as our Saviour Christ is one person, and the only head of his mystical body, so this whole Catholic Christ's mystical body is but one body under this one head Christ."*

In the same article it is further said, "I believe that all the particular churches in the world which be members of this Catholic Church, may all be called apostolical churches, as well as the Church of Rome, or any other church, wherein the Apostles themselves were sometime resident; forasmuch as they have received and be all founded upon the same faith and doctrine that the true Apostles of Christ did teach and profess." †

The same principle was accepted and asserted by Parliament. In the preamble of the Act relating to appeals, passed in 1532–3, it is affirmed "on the authority of sundry old authentic histories and chronicles, that this realm of England is an empire made up of spiritualty and temporalty, and so hath been accepted in the world, governed by one supreme head and king, having the dignity and royal estate of the imperial crown of the same unto whom the whole body politic, compact of spiritualty and temporalty, was bound to bear a natural and humble obedience." Passing from the State to the Church, it continues, "the body spiritual thereof, having power when any cause of the law divine happened to come in question, or of spiritual learning, then it was declared interpreted, and shewed by that part of the said body politic called the spiritualty, now being usually called the English Church, which always hath been reputed, and also found of that sort, that both for knowledge, *integrity*, and sufficiency of number, it hath always been

---

* 'Formularies of Faith,' p. 55.

† Ibid., p. 56.

thought, and is also at this time, sufficient and meet of itself without the intermeddling of any exterior person or persons to declare and determine all such doubts, and to administer all such offices and duties as to their room spiritual do appertain; for the due administration thereof, and to keep them from corruption and sinister affection, the king's most noble progenitors and the antecessors of the nobles of this realm, have sufficiently endowed the said Church both with honour and possessions. And the law temporal for trial of lands and goods, without rapine or spoil, was, and yet is, administered and adjudged and executed by secondary judges and ministers of the temporalty; and both their authorities and jurisdictions do conjoin together, in the due administration of justice, the one to help the other." *

What was thus asserted in Parliament was in full accordance with the doctrine and practice of the primitive Church. Of the catholicity and antiquity of this great principle, that each national Church has authority to conduct its own affairs without regard to foreign interference, a clear statement has been made by Archbishop Laud, who, though he was accused of Popery, yet in his conference with Fisher, proved himself to be the most effective and powerful of the opponents of the Papacy. "This right," he says of provincial synods, "that they might decree in causes of faith and in cases of reformation, where corruptions had crept into the Sacraments of Christ, was practised much above a thousand years ago by many, both national and provincial synods. For the Council at Rome, under Pope Sylvester, anno 324, condemned Photinus and Sabellius (and their heresies were of a high nature against the faith). The Council of Gangra about the same time (between 325 and 380) condemned Eustathius for his condemning of marriage as unlawful. The first Council at Carthage, being a provincial Council, condemned rebaptization much about the year 348. The provincial Council at Aquileia, in the year 381, in which St. Ambrose was present, condemned Palladius and Secundinus for embracing the Arian heresy. The second Council of Carthage handled and decreed the belief and preaching of the Trinity; and this a little after the year 424. The Council of

---

* 24 Henry VIII. c. 12.

Milevis in Africa, in which St. Augustine was present, condemned the whole course of the heresy of Pelagius, that great and bewitching heresy, in the year 416. The second Council of Orange—a provincial, too—handled the great controversies about grace and free will, and set the Church right in them in the year 444 (529). The third Council of Toledo (a national one) in the year 589, determined many things against the Arian heresy, about the very prime articles of faith, under fourteen several anathemas. The fourth Council of Toledo did not only handle matters of faith for the reformation of that people, but even added also some things to the Creed which were not *expressly* delivered in former creeds. Nay, the bishops did not only practise this to condemn heresies in national and provincial synods, and so reform these several places and the Church itself by parts; but they did openly challenge this as their right and due, and that without any leave asked of the See of Rome; for in this fourth Council of Toledo they decree, 'That if there happen a cause of faith to be settled, a general, that is, a national synod of all Spain and Galicia shall be held thereon;' and this in the year 643, where you see it was then Catholic doctrine in all Spain that a national synod might be a competent judge in a cause of faith. And I would fain know what article of faith doth more concern all Christians in general than that of *Filioque?* and yet the Church of Rome herself made that addition to the Creed without a general council . . . And if this were practised so often and in so many places, why may not a national council of the Church of England do the like." *

The Church legislated in strict accordance with the principles, both catholic and constitutional, laid down in Parliament. With scarcely a dissentient voice the Provincial synods of Canterbury and York, in the year 1534, declared that the Bishop of Rome had no greater jurisdiction in the Church and Realm of England than any other foreign bishop. The judgment of the Convocations was corroborated by the English Universities and by the Cathedrals, the members of which were accustomed, at that time, to meet for the purposes of deliberation; and proceeding in the same course, our Reformation became a mere re-adjust-

---

* Laud, 'Conference with Fisher,' sec. 24, pp. 126, 127. Oxford, 1839.

ment of our doctrinal and ritual system, such as, after the repudiation of the papal usurpations, and the re-assertion of the independence of the English Church, became a matter of necessity.

Our Prayer-Book is nothing more than the reduction into one Use for the whole Church of England of the four great Rituals which had been hitherto used in England,—those of Sarum, York, Bangor, and Lincoln. The Reformers were chiefly indebted to the Sarum Books, which had become the most popular and most generally adopted; and they reduced to one volume the Breviary, which contained the daily service, the Missal, which contained the Liturgy, properly so-called, or the Communion Service, and the Manual, which contained the other offices. When the work was completed, it was thus described: "Here you have an order of prayer and for the reading of Scripture much agreeable to the mind and purposes of the old Fathers," and as such it was received by the laity; it was received as a very godly order, agreeable to the Word of God and the primitive Church.

By the admission of Dodd, this work was so cautiously and judiciously conducted, that for a considerable time "a great many of the clergy conformed to it who otherwise were opposed to the reform doctrine." He says, "it varied very little, only in certain omissions, from the Latin Liturgy." * To this sub-

---

* Dodd, ii. 29. He here, as he frequently does, rather overstates his case. The opposition to the Prayer-Book originated not with Papists but with Puritans, whose complaint always was that the English Reformers did not go far enough. We may here remark on another charge brought against the Church, and reiterated, on the authority of the Puritans, by infidel historians, who are seen acting with them through their hatred of that Institution which is the bulwark of Christianity, and the object, consequently, of hatred to the infidel—the reformed Church of England. They would represent the Reformation as the work of the laity forced upon a reluctant clergy; whereas one of the advantages of our Reformation was that, Church and State being at that time identical, the clergy acted in concert with the laity, and except when the spoliation of the Church was concerned, the co-operation of the two orders in the Church was cordial. King Edward, in his message to the Devonshire Petitioners, affirms that the Book of Common Prayer was "by the whole clergy agreed" (Fox, v. 734). In requiring the Bishop of London, Dr. Bonner—as we find in a letter preserved in his register—to see to the better getting out of the Service book within his diocese,' the King's Council, in the year 1549, reminded him of the fact that, "after great and serious debating, and long conference with the bishops and other grave and well learned men in the Holy Scriptures, one uniform order for Common Prayer and administration of the Sacraments hath been and is most godly set forth, not only by common agreement and full assent of the nobility and commons of the late

ject we shall have occasion to revert; we will only here remark that, although our Reformers were careful not to "call evil good, or good evil; not to put darkness for light, or light for darkness; not to put bitter for sweet, or sweet for bitter; not to be wise in their own eyes and prudent in their own sight;" yet they gave heed at the same time to another scriptural injunction: "Thus saith the Lord, Stand ye in the ways, and see and ask for the old paths, and walk therein, and ye shall find rest unto your souls." *

We have already shewn, from the documents, the public deference paid by Parliament as well as by Convocation to "the old Catholic doctors." For example, in the order for prayer before sermons in 1535, the preacher was to pray for the whole Catholic Church of Christ, and specially for the *Catholic* Church of this realm. In the act against appeals to Rome, already quoted, it is said that the Clergy of the Realm shall administer all Sacraments and other offices, unto all the subjects of the same, "as *Catholic* and Christian men owen to do" (24 Henry VIII. c. 12). In the Act against Annats,† it is said that the king and all his subjects, "as well spiritual and temporal, being as obedient, devout, *Catholic* and humble children of God and holy church as any people be within any realm christened." The Act, 25 Henry VIII. c. 21, against Peter Pence, declares that the king and people of England "do not intend to decline or vary from the congregations of Christ's church in anything concerning the very articles of the Catholic faith in Christendom." We may also mention the 1 Eliz. i. § 36, touching heresy, which runs thus: "Provided always, and be it enacted by the authority aforesaid, that such person or persons to whom your Highness, your heirs or successors, shall hereafter, by letters patent under the Great Seal of England, give authority to have or to execute any jurisdiction, power or authority spiritual, or to visit, reform, order or correct any errors, heresies, schisms, abuses, or enormities,

---

session of the late Parliament, but also by the like assent of the bishops in the said Parliament, and of all other learned men of this our realm in their synods and convocations provincial."—Wilkins, iv. 35; see also Heylin's 'Tracts,' 40, 41. The Book of Common Prayer, he shews, was merely submitted to Parliament after its preparation, "not for preparation." The making one uniform order was the work of the clergy, the making of the penalties was the work of the Parliament.—Ib. 15, 16.

* Isaiah v. 20, 21; Jer. vi. 16.

† 23 Henry VIII. c. 33.

by virtue of this Act, shall not in any wise have authority or power to order, determine or adjudge any matter or cause to be heresie; but only such as have heretofore been determined, ordered or adjudged to be heresie, by the authority of the canonical Scriptures, or *by the first four General Councils*, or any of them, or by any other general council wherein the same was declared heresie by the express and plain words of the said canonical Scriptures, or such as hereafter shall be ordered, judged, or determined to be heresie, by the high court of Parliament of this realm with the assent of the Clergy in their Convocation." *

In her reply to Roman Catholic Princes, Queen Elizabeth proclaimed, "that there was no new faith propagated in England; no new religion set up but that which was commended by our Saviour, practised by the primitive Church, and approved by the Fathers of the *best* antiquity." † Moreover the very Convention of 1571, which originally enjoined subscription to the 39 Articles, comprised the principle of the English Reformation,—that of deferring not to the opinion of Calvin and other foreign Reformers, but to the primitive Church,—by decreeing that nothing should be taught as an Article of Faith, "except what is supported by Scripture and Catholic tradition;" ‡ which Principle is again enunciated in the 30th Canon, wherein it is affirmed that, "it was not the purpose of the Church of England to forsake or reject the Churches of Italy, France, Spain, Germany, or any such like Churches, in all things that they held and practised, and therefore it doth with reverence retain those ceremonies which do neither endamage the Church of God nor offend the minds of sober men; and only departed from them in those particular points wherein they were fallen both from themselves in their ancient integrity, and from the Apostolical Churches which were their first founders." §

Although the opinions of individuals, whether in the Reformation age or at any other time, can never be urged as an authority such as we seek only in the authentic documents and formularies of the Church, it is of historical importance to observe how the injunctions of the Church were, at this time, regarded and ap-

---

* Gibson's 'Codex,' p. 48.

† Collier ii. 136, fol. edit.

‡ Wilkins, iv. 267.

§ Canon 30.

plied by her functionaries. Among our early Reformers no one is more deserving of respectful notice than Bishop Cheney. At the peril of his life, in the reign of Queen Mary, when he was Archdeacon of Hereford, he was one of the six Reformers who, in the phrase of Puritanism, "undertook boldly the cause of the Gospel in a disputation against almost the whole synod." The following extracts are made from a sermon when he was Bishop of Bristol:—"These new writers in matters of controversy, as Mr. Calvin and others, agree not together; but are at dissension among themselves, and are together by the ears. Therefore take heed of them. Yet read them: for in opening the text they do pass many of the old fathers. And they are excellently well learned in the tongues: but in matters now in controversy follow them not; but follow *the old fathers and doctors*, although Mr. Calvin denieth some of them. 'Scriptures, Scriptures,' do you cry? Be not too hasty; for so the heretics always cried, and had the Scriptures. I would ask this question:—I have to do with an heretic; I bring Scripture against him; and he will confess it to be Scripture. But he will deny the sense that I bring it for. How now? How shall this be tried? *Marry by consent of Fathers only and not by others.* Good people, I must now depart shortly. Keep therefore this lesson with you. Believe not, neither follow this city, nor yet 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7; but follow you the *Catholic and universal consent.*"*

The principle, indeed, upon which our Reformers acted is sufficiently clear; but the question may here occur, Why should more of deference be paid to the opinions of the Fathers of the first three or four centuries than to the opinions of Luther and Calvin? and the answer is, That we refer to the writings of the early Fathers not for their opinions, but for the witness they bear to certain facts. Our desire is to ascertain what was delivered orally by the Apostles, with respect to doctrine or discipline in the churches they founded, some of them before the Scriptures of the New Testament were written. We do this, not because we think the Scriptures insufficient; but to enable us, especially on disputed points, to understand the Scriptures, and to elucidate what is obscure. That the Christians in the first ages of the Church acted on the same principle as our Reformers is well

---

* Strype's 'Annals,' i. Pt. 2, pp. 278–280.

known to every student of Ecclesiastical History; and this fact gives increased importance to an appeal to the primitive Church. It were easy to show, by a reference to the ancient writers themselves, that this *traditio exegetica* existed from the beginning. Irenæus, for example, speaks of the *κανὼν τῆς ἀληθείας*,[*] which is the same as the *κανὼν ἐκκλησιαστικός* of Clemens Alexandrinus.[†] The 'De Præscriptione' of Tertullian is only an application of this principle to heresies prevailing in his age. That a harmony of doctrine existed in all the apostolical churches, wheresoever situated, is indeed expressly affirmed by Irenæus,[‡] by Tertullian,[§] by Hegesippus,[‖] by Clemens Alexandrinus,[¶] and by Origen.[**]

The mere circumstance, that this principle was avowed, the profession of it being that which distinguished the Catholic from the Heretic, would incline us to take it for granted, that steps would be adopted for the preservation of the tradition in its more important features, genuine and pure; and this surmise we find to be an historical fact, on a reference to the pages of St. Cyprian and other Fathers. A constant correspondence was sustained between the Bishops of the most distant Churches; and the Father just mentioned, speaks of "their acting together with one harmonious concert."[††] The whole world, says Optatus, was united in one common society or communion by the mutual intercourse of canonical letters.[‡‡]

There was no more difficulty, when that system was once established, in carrying it out, than there is in maintaining a correspondence between different branches of a modern Sect: and so long as this intercourse lasted it was very improbable that the traditional doctrine should be materially corrupted.

---

[*] 'Adv. Hæres.,' Lib. vi. c. 13.

[†] 'Strom.,' Lib. vi. 15.

[‡] Lib. i., c. 10, *alias* 3. Lib. iii. c. 3.

[§] 'Præscript.' xx. xxviii.

[‖] Apud Euseb., Lib. iv. c. 22.

[¶] 'Strom.' vii., pp. 898, 899. Conf. 'Strom.' i., p. 322.

[**] The statement in Origen is so important that I insert it here: "Cum multi sint qui se putant scire quæ Christi sunt, et nonnulli eorum diversa prioribus sentiant servetur vero ecclesiastica prædicatio per successionis ordinem ab apostolis tradita et *usque ad præsens in ecclesiis* (the third century) permanens: illa sola credenda veritas *quæ in nullo ab ecclesiastica traditione discordat.*" Origen in 'Apolog. Pamph. cum App. Hieron.' tom. i. p. 233.

[††] St. Cyprian, Ep. 55 and 68. See also 59, 45, 25, 29, 63, where there is a reference to this fact. Some passages are here taken from a volume of University Sermons by the author, preached in the year 1837, which, after passing through three editions, has been for several years out of print.

[‡‡] Lib. ii., p. 48.

This brings us to remark on the reason why the Reformers deferred to the first four Œcumenical Councils, and not to the other Councils so called. Later Councils were summoned to define the truth, and what was asserted as truth was received on the authority of the Council. But the Bishops who attended the first four Councils attended simply as witnesses; the object was to ascertain and defend the Universal tradition on the subject in dispute, in opposition to the heretics who cared not for the tradition of the Churches, but brought their private judgment to bear upon the Scriptures. The Fathers of the Nicene Council were, indeed, careful to proclaim the fact, that the Form of Faith they promulgated was not an invention or declaration of their own: they merely repeated what they had themselves received when they were first instructed in the principles of our Holy Religion. At the commencement of the Session, when the Logicians began to dispute and discuss, they were immediately put to silence;—the Fathers had come together, as was expressly stated, not to debate upon the faith, but to bear testimony. The fact is fairly stated in a letter addressed by Eusebius to his diocese: "As we have received by tradition from our predecessors, the Bishops, then when we were instructed in the first principles of the Faith and received Baptism,—as we have learned from the Holy Scriptures, so also we do now believe, and we make a public declaration of our faith." *

It were easy to show, that the same principle prevailed in the other three General Councils received as authoritative by our Reformers; but, to avoid prolixity, I shall merely refer to the last of the four,—that of Chalcedon. The object of this Synod was to vindicate the doctrine which from the beginning had been unshaken; it was convened for the express purpose of preventing the introduction of novelties; the members openly disclaimed any wish to add to the faith; and they as solemnly professed to follow the steps of the Fathers.†

It is not meant to affirm, that nothing was debated at these Councils, for there were many points of discipline brought under discussion;—it is only said that such was not the case when Articles of Faith were under consideration.

Nothing proves more strongly the distinction now indicated

---

* Socrates, Lib. i. c. 8.

† Evagrius Scholasticus, Lib. ii. cap. 4

than the difference adopted in the form of words, when any canon, pertaining merely to a rite or ceremony, was framed, from that which was employed when assent was given to an article of faith. In the former case, the form was *ἔδοξε τὰ ὑποτεταγμένα*—these things seem good to us; in the latter, it was said *οὕτως πιστεύει ἡ καθολικὴ ἐκκλησία*—so the Catholic Church believes, not presuming to act on its own judgment, but simply declaring the fact of the tradition.*

Our Reformers were not guilty of any inconsistency when they accepted, on these grounds, the authority of the first four General Councils, although, with respect to subsequent Councils, they affirmed that they may err, and sometimes have erred. The distinction drawn by them is a distinction of very great importance at the present time. Our Reformers refused to attend the Council of Trent; our present bishops ignore the authority of the Council summoned by the Bishop of Rome, (*a*) because we require no addition to be made to the Word of God; (*b*) because, while it claims to be Œcumenical, it violates all the conditions which universal Christendom deems essential to that character. We refuse to accept any new article of Faith. We hold the Faith once—and once for all—delivered to the Saints. We avoid a Council such as is now summoned; we defer to the first four Councils because they were summoned to bear witness to the truth as confided to them: they were, as they are described by all of the Fathers, conservatories of the Faith.

Such being the principles on which the Reformation of the Church of England was conducted, we must repeat the remark, that by the student of ecclesiastical history the difficulties with which our Reformers had to contend, and the character of the great work they accomplished, will never be clearly understood until he mentally detaches the English Reformation from the revolutionary proceedings in Saxony and Switzerland. Luther, and more decidedly Calvin, are to be regarded as the founders of that system of Divinity which has ever distin-

---

* Athanasius, De Syn., quoted by Hammond in his 'Parænesis,' p. 558. He continues, "To which purposes I suppose the second versicle in the doxology (the orthodox form of acknowledging the Trinity), '*As it was in the beginning*,' as it stood by the original tradition apostolical, 'is now and ever shall be, world without end.'" No new doctrine was ever to be brought into the Church, by whatsoever Council, but only that which the Apostles delivered. How grievously the Church of Rome is now acting in violation of the principles of the Primitive Church must be at once apparent.

guished the Protestant Dissenters in England from the members of the English Church. With them are all the sympathies of continental Protestants. Down to the present hour, the Church of England is by foreign Protestants regarded with disfavour.

It would have been well for the cause of truth, if this disconnection of the English from the Continental Reformation had been from the first openly declared. That by our Reformers it was soon perceived is shown by the quotation already made from Bishop Cheney; at the same time, we must admit that, although they soon deviated from many of his opinions, yet to the writings of Luther many of our early Reformers were indebted for the first thoughts they entertained of reforming the Church, though from his opinions they soon diverged. There was naturally a sympathy felt for those who were engaged in the same cause, though engaged in a different manner; and we must always bear in mind, that while the continental movement was in progress, carrying with it so much that commended itself to the English mind, it was hoped and expected that, ere the work was completed, the Germans would have proceeded in the same direction as the English. All wished for union, if union could be effected without sacrifice of principle; but when Calvin appeared on the field, it was soon perceived that it was only by such a sacrifice—by converting the Church into a sect—that the forces of all parties opposed to Rome could be united. In a letter to Bullinger, Beza, Calvin's successor at Geneva, states his opinion, that the English Church was in a lamentable condition; for there, he was informed, "Popery was never thrown out." He afterwards, with considerable *naïveté*, informs his correspondent that "Queen Elizabeth had a strong aversion to the Geneva Church; that she had received his annotations without the least sign of welcome." *

The Queen had been indoctrinated by Matthew Parker, a prelate to whose learning, caution, and clear-sightedness, the Church of England is deeply indebted. Although by a capricious temper, and through the intrigues of greedy courtiers whose appetence for the property of the Church induced them to extend their patronage to those who could overthrow the

---

* Collier, ii. 505.

Church, rather than to those who could reform it, she was sometimes led into inconsistencies of word and action, yet she continued to the last to adhere to the principles which enabled her to draw the line with a steady hand between the Reformation she aided and the Revolutions which were elsewhere tending to anarchy.

When Parker unwillingly accepted the Primacy there were two great parties in the land, the one numerically, the other intellectually strong. In the first place, there was that large party through the length and the breadth of the land which, as had been the case with their ancestors for several centuries, were resolutely opposed to the usurpations of the Bishop of Rome; but who, after the assertion of the Church's independence, and when the crying practical grievances connected with the ecclesiastical courts had been redressed, were unwilling to advance a step further in the way of reformation. They were doggedly Conservative. They were attached to the ancient ceremonies of the Church; they listened with impatience to the preachers of the "new learning." They evaded often, though they seldom openly opposed, the new enactments; they seemed, to a jealous and watchful government, to be like an inert mass of inflammable matter, which any aristocratic demagogue or fanatical partisan, if such a one should appear, might easily ignite.

Nevertheless this party, unintentionally, strengthened the hands of those of our Reformers who, like Parker, desired to change as little as possible; and whose object it was, while reforming abuses, to retain what they could of all which, through long use, had been endeared to the hearts, though not sanctified by the faith of his contemporaries.

The policy of English Reformers, to which allusion has been already made, in seeking through concession to win the masses to the Reformation, was peculiarly offensive to the foreign Reformers. The historian of the Puritans informs us,* that "the Service in the Queen's Chapel, and in *sundry Cathedrals* was so splendid and showy, that foreigners could not distinguish it from the Roman, except that it was performed in the English tongue." He admits, however, that

---

* Neal, i. 156.

this policy was successful, for he adds: "By this method most of the popish laity were deceived into conformity, and came regularly to church for nine or ten years, till the Pope, being out of all hopes of an accommodation, forbade them, by excommunicating the Queen, and laying the whole nation under an interdict." *

In the course of nine or ten years, a large portion of those who had at first regarded the Reformation movement with suspicion, had become reconciled to the proceedings of their rulers; and we may attribute to this wise policy the fact, that, although at the commencement of Elizabeth's reign, the tendency of the careless and *non*-religious—if we may separate this class from the *ir*religious,—was to oppose the Reformation, before her reign came to a close the prejudices of the mass of the people lay in the very opposite direction. Neal, without approving, honestly asserts the principle of the English Reformers: "The English Reformers wished to depart *no further from the Church of Rome than she did from the primitive Church.*" † So early as the time of Ridley this fundamental axiom of the English Reformation was asserted by Bishop Ridley:—"Sudden changes," says the martyr, "without substantial necessary causes, and the heady setting forth of extremities, we did never love." ‡

To the wisdom of this policy ample testimony is borne by M. Rognie, the French Ambassador, who declared upon a view of our solemn Service and ceremonies, "If the reformed Churches in France had kept the same advantage of order and decency, I am confident there would have been many thousand Protestants in that country more than there are." §

Justice is seldom done to the wise policy of Elizabeth's government, in thus conciliating the great body of the people, in spite of the constant, the unceasing clamour of the ultra-Protestants.

A similar conciliatory spirit was exhibited towards the ultra-Protestants themselves, but with less success. They were never satisfied, until they overthrew the monarchy which had offered protection to that old Catholic party which has never ceased to exercise its influence in the English Church.

On the accession of Queen Elizabeth, the religionists who in

---

* Neal, i. 56. † Ibid. ‡ Martyr's 'Letters,' p. 40. § Collier, ii. 677.

the preceding reign had lived in exile on the Continent, returned to their native land. A few of them returned prepared to abide by those principles of the English Reformation which, at peril of life and limb, had been consistently adhered to by Parker and others who, remaining at home, were uncontaminated by contact with the foreigner. But others there were, who, inebriated by Calvinism, were determined as Strype observes—himself a decided Protestant,—"to accommodate this Church of England to the Geneva model." These men, he remarks, were "especially angry with the Bishops and their order, because they were the *chief opposers of the new discipline;* and thereupon they did what they could to pull up the hierarchy by the roots, asserting it to be Anti-Christian, and utterly unlawful to be exercised in the Christian Church."*

While they were yet abroad, a controversy had arisen between those who adhered to the English Reformation and the advocates of the foreign system. The Prayer-Book itself was violently assailed: it was said, and truly said, to be only the Missal, the Breviary, and the Manual readjusted and re-arranged, and through it, it was asserted, the Reformation in England would only be a new phase of Romanism. An appeal was made to Calvin, whose judgment was that our Book of Common Prayer "contained many fooleries, tolerable only from the exigency of the times when it was translated and remodelled —*tolerabiles ineptiæ.*" He expressed a special dislike of our Reformers, for being attached to the ancient forms of devotion, and complained of them as of men who "*delighted in the dregs of Popery.*"† So clearly did this great but mistaken man perceive that the English Reformation was in principle to be distinguished from his own.

The representatives of the foreign Reformation were at first called Puritans, and afterwards Evangelicals—unfairly assuming a title which implies the condemnation of their opponents, as if they were not the preachers of the Gospel. After a time they split into two factions.

The one party, the more determined and conscientious, the precursors of modern Dissenters, were prepared, for conscience' sake, to run all risks, to defy the law, and to upset the

---

* Strype's 'Parker,' ii. 285. † Ibid., 283.

rights of toleration. They were more or less persecuted, until they obtained power, and then they became persecutors themselves—for it was long before either party could understand the meaning, the virtue, and the sound policy of toleration. Their plea for their dissent was the Popery of our Reformers. The Protestation of the Puritans against the English Reformation commences thus:—"Being thorough persuaded in my conscience by the working and word of the Almighty, that *these relics of Anti-Christ* be abominable before the Lord our God, and also that by the power, mercy, strength, and goodness of the Lord our God, only, I am escaped *from the filthiness and pollution of these detestable traditions*, I have joined in prayer and praising God's Word with those who have not yielded *to this idolatrous trash*, notwithstanding the dangers," &c. "Therefore I come not back again to the *preaching of them that have received the marks of the Romish Beast*." "These *Popish Garments* are now become very idols indeed, because they are exalted above the word of the Almighty. I come not to them, the English Reformers, because they should be ashamed, and so leave these idolatrous garments."* So among the *demands* of the so-called Millenary petition, one runs that "no Popish opinion should be any more taught or defended, no *minister charged* to bow at the name of Jesus."† In the 'Plea of the Innocents,' those who adhered to the English Reformation, as distinguished from the Puritans, are called "sychophantizing Papists, *statizing* Priests." Queen Elizabeth is spoken of as "a *defendresse* of beggarly, Popish, and *unchristian* rites."‡ In the admonition to Parliament our Prayer-Book is said to be "patched up of the Pope's portuise; it is an imperfect book, culled and picked out of the Popish dung-hill; the Mass-book, full of abominations."§

It was for the Civil Government to deal with these, the nonconforming Puritans. The Church had to encounter an increasing body of persons who, doctrinally agreeing with the Nonconformists, professed a readiness to conform, but openly declared their intention to undermine the principles which their bolder brethren openly attacked. The Catholic party, though

---

* Heylin's 'Presbyterians,' 15, 16.

† Strype's 'Whitgift,' ii. 480.

‡ Ibid., 479.

§ Strype's 'Annals,' lib. ii. 168.

numerous, was quiescent: the conforming Puritans, though less numerous, were many of them well-informed in continental and modern theology, and if not fanatical, like their nonconforming brethren, were active. These, the representatives of the foreign Reformation in our Church, caused the greatest annoyance and difficulty to the English Reformers. Writing to another prelate, Archbishop Parker observes:—"These are troublous times. The Church is sorely assaulted, but not so much of open enemies as of pretended favourers and false brethren, who, under colour of Reformation, seek our ruin." *

These persons conformed, in order that, in all future proceedings, they might have a voice. Parker, meantime, and the Bishops who acted with him, were anxious to make every concession, short of the sacrifice of principle, to prevent them from seceding from the Church. The Bishops had conciliated the Catholics, they sought also to conciliate the Puritan party. Their practical difficulty was this, that, when they sought to conciliate the one party by concessions made to the other, they lost on the one side the ground they had gained on the other.

Any one who has examined this portion of history must be aware, that nothing can be further from the truth than the assertion that our formularies were drawn up purposely indefinite; and that the object of our Reformers was not the assertion of the truth, but the comprehension of discordant elements of thought.

In a Church, as distinguished from a Sect, where, instead of deferring to the decision of a despotic founder, a debate is raised among those who have all an equal right to be heard, discrepancies in the statement of doctrine cannot always be avoided; and it may be difficult occasionally to reconcile what is said at one time with what has been ruled at another; but Parker's determination was evidently this—to yield as little as possible, to retain what was ancient when it was not unscriptural, and, if defeated in one point, to render the defeat harmless by securing some other protective position.

In a word, it was his business to see that the Church maintained her Catholicity, and that in all her formularies she remained orthodox; opposed to what was mediæval and Roman,

---

* Strype's 'Parker,' ii. 286.

but, at the same time, adhering strictly to what was primitive and apostolical. That he was sometimes defeated is to be lamented, but he only shared the fate of other rulers of the Church; a consequence unavoidable when there is ecclesiastical legislation. What is asserted in a Sect remains as long as the Sect shall last; what is enacted in a Church may be repealed or re-enacted: this is the very object of Councils and Synods.

The great work of the Elizabethan Reformers was to place the drag on the chariot wheels of the Reformation, when Fanaticism was grasping at the reins.

When the Reformers had secured the preservation of Catholic truth, and that truth was enunciated in the formularies of the Church, their business was completed: if any one chose to place a wrong construction upon the declaration or the formulary, this was a matter to be settled between the offender's conscience and his God. The simple question asked by the rulers of the Church was, whether the person aspiring to high position in the Church would subscribe our formularies? With the mental reservation, if there were any on the part of the subscriber, the rulers of the Church had nothing to do. Thus the Puritans as well as the Catholics remained in the Church—the latter because it was a branch of the one Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church; the former from mere sectarian feeling. Conforming Puritans have now come to regard it as one of the best among modern sects, or if not the best, an institution in the emoluments of which they may claim a share.

We have now stated the principle upon which, down to the last review of the Prayer-Book in the reign of Charles II., our Reformers continued to act. Our formularies have been unequivocal and orthodox; but the Puritan party, still existing in the Church, have received them in a non-natural sense. Their conduct has sometimes occasioned surprise; but it has been ruled in the courts of law, that, if they accept the formularies, we have no right to examine them as to the sense in which they receive them, or to deprive them of their benefices. We may quote a few instances.

In our Ordinal and its preface, compared with other formularies, nothing can be more clear than the statement of the Apostolical Succession,—that is, the affirmation of there being a

Universal Church as distinguished from the Sects, a community originating in the Apostles, a Divine incorporation; and this is of especial importance, because this is one of the chief facts by which the continuity of our Church is proved:—it certainly is not the fault of the Church if an individual, after giving his assent and consent to the formulary in order that he may obtain a benefice, declares that he disbelieves the fact. If a plain man reads our Baptismal Services, he sees that what the Church has always believed is there most fully expressed,—the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration; a doctrine which of course pervades the whole of our services, derived as they are from Catholic sources; but this, like the former doctrine, is directly opposed to Calvinism; and if he who uses the office, uses it with a mental reservation, according to which a negative construction is placed upon the strongest affirmatives, the fault again does not rest with the Church: the Church can require us to speak, but she cannot control thought. Again, we may be astonished to hear persons, who enjoy the emoluments of the Church, speaking in disparagement of the Sacraments; but for their so doing they are responsible not to man but to God: the Church has done her part when she asserts that a Sacrament is a means of Grace, that the Grace of Baptism is Regeneration, and that in the Lord's Supper the Body and Blood of Christ are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful. She has not asserted, that a man cannot receive what is absent; but she compels her children to pray to Almighty God that in the Holy Sacrament "they may so eat the Flesh of His dear Son Jesus Christ, and drink His Blood, that their sinful bodies may be made clean by the Body of Christ, and their souls washed through His Blood." The Church directs those who have received the Communion to thank God, "for that He doth vouchsafe to feed those who have duly received those Holy Mysteries, with the spiritual food of the most precious Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ." If you go to the Church, you find her distinguishing, under this head, between mediæval corruption and primitive truth; but she must leave men to place their own construction on the orthodox language she employs.

It is necessary to advert to these sacred subjects, that the reader may have before him the decided, orthodox, Catholic

1867711

assertions of the Church, and that he may also see the non-natural meaning which may to these assertions be attached.

There seems to be an infatuation on the part of those who care for none of these things, inducing them to applaud every person who seems to act contrary to his professions, and who, having entered into certain engagements, finds pleasure in escaping the penalties attached to his violation of the same; and so popular did the Puritan party at one time become, that they who understood our formularies in the plain and literal sense of the words were actually denounced as unorthodox. Calvinism was, for a short time, held up as the standard by which a man's orthodoxy was to be tested, and that, too, in our Universities.

They seemed, indeed, at the commencement of the present century, to be carrying all before them, until, unexpectedly, a new party arose. The party, at first called the Tractarian and now the Ritualist party, contend for the introduction into the English Church of mediæval practices; and they assert dogmas which are scarcely to be distinguished from some of the errors of the Church of Rome.

To this party, those who adhere to the principles of the English Reformers and who were, till of late years, known, on that account, as High Churchmen, are as much opposed as they have ever been to the Puritans, and on the same grounds. They are opposed both to Puritan and Ritualist, because neither the Puritan nor the Ritualist accepts the principles of the English Reformation.

We are in these days in a position the very opposite to that in which our Reformers were placed in the age of Queen Elizabeth. The non-religious multitude, who nevertheless take interest in religious questions because they bear upon political and social life, were in her days Romanising in their tendencies; the war-cry of the non-religious in these days is Protestantism. By Protestants a large party mean a protest not only against popery, but against all religion. It is, indeed, on Protestant principles, and the exercise of their private judgment, that by this party the most sacred truths of the Gospel are assailed. They are formidable because, through the common title, they make common cause in politics with those who by Protestantism mean Calvinism, or, at all events, the principles of the foreign

Reformers as opposed to those of the English Reformers. Upon the Ritualists they make a common assault. Exeter Hall and the mob are found to be in alliance. It has just been said that the old Catholic party—those who, having examined the principles of the English Reformation, have adopted them as their own—have no sympathy with modern Romanisers; but assuredly we are bound to act towards all parties with impartiality and justice. The only difference between the Tractarian and the Puritan, in regard to the formularies of our Church, is this, that the former honestly, if not discreetly, have avowed the principle upon which the other party has, from the time of the Reformation, never ceased to act.

The Puritans did not use the term non-natural; but what else is meant, when they clothe in the garment of Calvinism what the Church has laid before them as plain and simple Catholic truth?

By men whose minds are unbiassed, both parties are justly condemned. The question ought to be, not whether the Church may be so tortured as to give an apparent sanction to a preconceived opinion; but what was it that the Church meant when the Church gave utterance to this or that dogma? But if this principle be not accepted, then we must, as just men, contend, that if the thumb-screw be allowable to one party, it cannot be withheld from the other. To the Puritan, when he censures the Ritualist for doing what the Puritan has been accustomed from time immemorial to do, we must be permitted to say—

> Quum tua pervideas oculis mala lippus inunctis,
> Cur in amicorum vitiis tam cernis acutùm,
> Quàm aut aquila, aut serpens Epidaurius? At tibi contrà
> Evenit, inquirant vitia ut tua rursus et illi.
>
> HORACE, Sat. I. iii. 25.

But there arises a practical difficulty of no ordinary importance.

If we admit the right of each party to place its own construction on our formularies, we must come at last to the conclusion that we possess no authoritative statement of doctrine whatever.

Not long since, an avowed Freethinker was required to sign the Thirty-nine Articles, for admission into some University office. He did not withhold his signature for a minute; he

only added: "I put my own construction on the Articles, and I sign them with the understanding that by doing so I merely declare the indisputable fact that I profess to be a member of the Church of England;" and so ready are men to applaud a defiance of authority, that it was in the midst of a buzz of applause that he did what to some men would appear to be an act of dishonesty. A man is a noble man who, rather than do what he thinks to be wrong, submits to the spoiling of goods or any other worldly loss; but the man who, to carry a worldly object or to obtain a high social position, does what he knows to be wrong and treats it as a jest, is one of whom we decline to speak, lest in making the attempt we overstep the bounds of modesty and decorum.

The question is—we repeat it—the principle having been conceded to the Puritans, where is it to stop?

It is a question more easily asked than satisfactorily answered. But when a book like the present is laid before the public, the wise reader, before he proceeds to the perusal of it, will enquire as to the leading principles from which the writers have started. If he be satisfied with their principles, he will be prepared to pay the deference which is due to their opinions, even if their opinions differ from the opinions which he has himself antecedently formed. Their principles are those of the English Reformation. In opposition to Papist and Puritan, the banner which our Reformers unfurled was that of the Catholic Church. Our Labarum is the standard of orthodoxy upraised in the primitive ages. While our eyes are fixed on the Cross of Calvary, our ears hear the great Captain of our Salvation—*In hoc signo vinces.*

WALTER FARQUHAR HOOK, D.D.

ESSAY I.

THE COURSE AND DIRECTION OF MODERN RELIGIOUS THOUGHT.

By the Right Rev. C. J. ELLICOTT, D.D.,

Lord Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol.

CONTENTS OF ESSAY I.

Difficulty of estimating the true direction of contemporary thought.

Necessary retrospect: the Oxford movement; its origin and characteristics.

Revived study of Scripture interpretation; results arrived at.

Approaching changes in respect of doctrine and interpretation.

Reaction from Calvinism, and tendency to semi-Pelagian views.

Emergence of the free-thought party; *Essays and Reviews;* its tenor and characteristics.

Secret of its influence; its appeal to current doubts and difficulties.

Distinctive error of the volume; the true view of Scripture inspiration.

Effects of the volume on modern thought in reference to soteriology.

The doctrine of the Atonement dependent on the doctrine of the Person of Christ.

Emergence of serious questions connected with eschatology.

The doctrine of the eternity of Divine punishments.

Consideration of the question with reference to Scripture; preponderance on the side of the received view.

Consideration of the same with reference to

- (*a*) The experiences of life; and
- (*b*) The love and purpose of God.

Summary from both considerations.

Reappearance of doubts as to our Lord's divinity; their immediate origin.

Latent Socinianism of *Ecce Homo.*

Spread of refined Socinianism; librations of opinion, and the causes of them.

Favourable effect produced by recent spiritual labours.

The present only a pause, of which, however, advantage may be taken.

The two conclusions to which we are now led.

Our duty at the present crisis.

Its difficulty, owing to our neglect of systematic theology.

Fundamental truths must be stated with knowledge and sympathy.

Scriptural speculation probably now of great use; closing illustrations of it.

- (*a*) The Eternal Trinity and the primal counsel.
- (*b*) The first commencement of sin, and its effects.
- (*c*) View taken by early thinkers.
- (*d*) Relations of the fallen spirit-world to our own.

Two useful tendencies of all such speculations—

- (*a*) As showing the deeper meanings of old truths.
- (*b*) As elevating life and practice.

Conclusion.

THE COURSE AND DIRECTION OF MODERN RELIGIOUS THOUGHT.

It is always difficult to form a fair estimate of the general direction of contemporary religious thought. Even if it be generally felt that opinion is demonstrably moving towards certain convictions and persuasions, yet as that opinion is the sort of resultant of many lines of thought, leaving perhaps the same point at very different angles, it is commonly difficult, if not impossible, to point out the true line of ultimate effect. If such a remark be true generally, it is certainly eminently true of the present time; for not only are the recognised lines of thought very numerous and varied, but indications are also present that a change of ultimate direction, due apparently to the action of as yet hardly recognised forces, has already commenced. No one, for instance, who has closely observed the direction of religious thought among us could for a moment maintain that our general opinion in reference to some of the points most keenly debated is the same in direction now as it was, say only ten years ago. Ten years ago the whole current of modern thought seemed steadily setting against the supernatural in religion. Science had been making vast strides; law seemed everywhere discoverable; evolution was to be traced in all things spiritual or physical around us; we were represented to be the subjects of a reign of law, and we were often reminded of that reign in terms that fairly provoked rebellion. Hard, dry, cynical, and often repulsive expressions, in reference to the ideal and the supernatural, were current in our better literature. We seemed in danger of a complete anti-crusade against all things most dear to the speculative and the idealist. But this is not the case now. We are now, it would seem, just arrived at what mathematicians would call a "point of contrary flexure" in religious thought. Doubt and scepticism prevail just as much as before—perhaps even more pervasively —but the lines along which they are moving are distinctly

changed. Whether the change is for the better or for the worse it is now hard to predict. The present paper will perhaps hazard some forecasts of opinion on the subject; but little more seems fairly recognisable than this—that there *is* a change in current thought in reference to most momentous questions, and that now especially is a time when a little cool and moderate thought may be beneficial alike for the present and the future.

At any rate, we seem permitted to have escaped for a while out of the hands of doctrinaires and philosophers, and may very wisely use our humble and perhaps brief liberty in thinking, speculating, and even ideally constructing without any present apprehensions from the reign of law, or from anything that may be symbolized by that singularly disagreeable form of thought and expression. Let us think freely, then, our own thoughts, apart from all theories, constructive or destructive, and endeavour, as well as we may, to discern whither we are moving, and what thoughts and suggestions we may best carry with us as our viaticum for the changing way.

We must necessarily take a cursory look backward, so as to estimate more fairly and correctly our present position in the wide realm of religious opinion. Suppose we turn our thoughts backward a single generation. We then find ourselves in the midst of the great Oxford movement. Sober thinkers were then beginning to realise that the Church of England was something more than a religious community bound together by some thirty-nine ties of greater or less elasticity. Our historic connection with the early Church was beginning to be more fairly realised; our discipline, such as it was and is, was admitted to reflect, at any rate, *some* primitive usages and principles; our Liturgy was perceived to be something more than the fifth edition of a mid-sixteenth century document; our clergy were felt to have some claim to be considered a definite and even Apostolically-descended Order; nay, there was even some willingness to admit that they had individually some powers and privileges to which the layman could not reasonably lay claim. The movement was, in a word, objective in all its leading characteristics; and was due, in a great degree, to the revulsion of thought in leading minds from the excessive and almost repulsive subjectivity of the later periods of the great

religious movement that had immediately preceded. That subjectivity had run out its course, and a change had come. Personal religion was fast declining into spiritual selfishness. What once had been vital, enthusiastic, and energizing, had now become dull, sectarian, and self-centred. One answer only seemed forthcoming to the second of those three great questions which each age of the Church has ever to meet and reply to, and that answer, it was clear, needed much rectification. To meet the difficult "Why here?" by the then prevailing and promptly-given answer: "Why here?—why to save my own immortal soul"—thus to resolve the whole mysterious problem of the present probationary attitude of the race into exclusive adjustments for individual interests, could satisfy no earnest and devout thinker who realised Christian membership and felt the real mystery of his relation to his fellow-men. The great Oxford movement, without formally addressing itself to these deeper questions, and often even with a seeming unconsciousness of their full religious significance, nevertheless, at once began to supply the right answers. The corporate life of the Church, her blessed union and membership with the Head, the vitality of the Sacraments, the enduring bond between the faithful on earth and the waiting company in Paradise—all these great objective truths were felt to be the needed teachings for the times, and were readily and warmly embraced by thousands who never paused to inquire into the deeper reasons why then especially they seemed so welcome and so appropriate. They were, however, the correctives of the prevailing religious selfishness, and as such found that almost sudden acceptance which was so marked a characteristic of those times, and the effects of which, though modified, are still to be distinctly traced and felt in the Christian life of our own day. To the Oxford movement every chivalrous and high-minded thinker, be his exact religious persuasions what they may, must feel an enduring debt of gratitude. It restored to the Church, at a time when mere individual interests seemed to be absorbing all the religious life within her, those pure and unselfish conceptions of union and communion which are now exercising such a potent influence among us, and which are showing themselves in such strange yearnings and developments.

Such, if we may venture thus broadly to generalise, was the

prevailing characteristic of the Oxford movement in connection with the progress of religious thought. It caused the true idea of the Church to be re-accepted and realised. It brought out the deep meaning of her Sacraments. It also turned attention to her archives. Scripture and its interpretation came thus almost necessarily into prominence in the closing years of the period we are now considering. It was impossible for a movement which rested so much on primitive antiquity, and appealed so much to patristic teaching, not also to reintroduce many of the results of patristic interpretation. After the utter license of subjective interpretation that had prevailed in the Church previous to the Oxford movement, men turned with thankfulness to every indication of generally-received principles, and especially to every statement of generally-admitted results. The idea of a sort of *interpretatio recepta*, of which traces were to some extent discoverable in the leading Greek interpreters, was as welcome as it was timely. Attention was quickly turned to Scriptural exegesis, and for the second ten years of the generation we are now considering, the study of the Holy Scriptures, more especially of the New Testament, made great and real progress. Principles, which are admitted and acknowledged up to this very hour, were slowly but securely developed; the peculiarities of each holy writer were considered; passages of difficulty were more and more dealt with in their contextual connection; doctrinal and historical deductions, sometimes of great practical interest, were drawn with every reasonable appearance of certitude; the interpretation of the New Testament, in a word, was completely rehabilitated. This success was providentially enhanced by almost contemporaneous movements in the study of grammar and general philology. The system, introduced by Becker in German grammar, of breaking up sentences into clauses, and estimating logically their relations and dependence, had been applied very successfully to Latin and Greek, and was at once utilised in the interpretation of the New Testament. The good results of this became very soon apparent, particularly in the interpretations of the epistolary portions of the inspired Volume, and were so readily and generally accepted that it really seemed as if we were approaching a time when an authoritative revision of at least the New Testament might be undertaken with considerable prospects of

success. Now that we are in a position to judge more dispassionately, we see that it is a subject for great thankfulness that such a revision was never attempted. We were all too new at our work. Though great advances had been made in Scriptural interpretation during the period we are considering, yet it seems now clear that in any revision that might have been undertaken at that time the critical and grammatical machinery would have been far too apparent. We should have all *Grecized.* We might have made a more accurate version, but we should almost certainly have destroyed the marvellous tone of our present version, and have changed disadvantageously the idiomatic flavour of its generally faithful and felicitous diction.* No better proof of the truth of this can be found than the various versions themselves which were published at the time by individual scholars.

Still, as has been already stated, great progress was made in interpretation and in the general study of the Holy Scriptures. A very important principle had also been almost unconsciously established, viz., this—that, as a general rule, the most trustworthy method of interpreting was to re-edit, with such corrections as modern grammatical precision suggested, the older current interpretations that were found in the commentaries of men who spoke the language of the original. It is well especially to notice this, as it seems by no means unreasonable to think that ere very long the same principle will be as successfully followed in the case of Christian doctrine. Widely as we differ in the realm of dogmatic teaching, and varied as now are the schools of religious thought in this country, clearly defined as is the effort to efface rather than to perpetuate the lines of doctrinal distinctions, still there does seem at the present time very clear indication of a willingness on the part of many of our forward thinkers to re-accept the Nicene theology when clearly and philosophically stated, and when cleared of

---

* Whether the time now has arrived for such an attempt it is very hard to decide. There seems some reason for thinking it has. Though our technical scholarship is not so good as it was fifteen or twenty years ago, yet we have certainly obtained more mastery over materials. The historical school of interpretation, which of late has been gradually developing, has also given much of the breadth that was noticeably wanting in the efforts of an earlier period. There certainly seems a re-awakening interest in the subject, which itself is a sign of no slight importance.

those conventional incrustations which had gathered round it in the controversies of later centuries.

But, to return to our retrospect, it would seem that if the first decade of the generation we are now endeavouring to estimate was marked by a very distinct and salutary appreciation of what may be termed Church doctrines, and of the corporate life and relations of the individual; the second decade was especially marked by a revival of sound Scriptural interpretation, and by the establishment of several principles and canons which will probably never be materially modified. In Church matters, generally, this second decade was also, for the most part, a time of quiet progress. The doctrinal principles of the preceding period had now been fairly assimilated, and, after some sharp though short conflicts (as in the Gorham and other controversies), were passing into practice, and exercising a distinct influence on the religious services of the Church. What has been called, for want of a better name, the Anglican system, was steadily developing itself, and obtaining a very great hold on the minds of sober and religious people. It may be admitted that it was a little chilly and frigid, and it certainly also must be admitted that it did not at that time acquire that influence over the young, and over portions of the lower middle class, that has since been obtained through the medium of more sensuous forms of worship, and a more emphasized sacramental teaching. Still it then was, as it now remains, a great power in the religious life of the country.

But great changes, which had been silently maturing for some years, were now close at hand. We have already observed that the Oxford movement included a very distinct teaching in reference to primitive doctrine, and also that by its appeal to such doctrine and to early patristic theology, it had opened the way for the study of the Scriptures on more careful and accurate principles than had ever before been laid down. In each of these two directions there were to be great and even startling changes. Let us especially turn our attention to these changes, and trace them through the course of the ten-year period in which we are now living.

What we may first observe is this, that a feeling had long been growing up antagonistic to the teaching of the great religious party which has claimed, and in many respects with

justice, the title of Evangelical. The antagonism especially showed itself in questions connected with Salvation, and with the authority and inspiration of the Scriptures. Much of the teaching that involved the theory of imputation, whether of sin or righteousness, was regarded as inconsistent with principles of justice and even of morality. That compact, logical, and, may we not say without offence, cheerless system, that rested for its foundations on the Institutes of Calvin, especially called out the most marked repulsion in minds of high sensibilities and sympathies. A half-Pelagian reaction soon began to show itself, which, to speak very frankly, could hardly be wondered at. Men, with the writings of the great Greek Fathers in their hands, and with a constitutional bias towards that breadth of teaching that they found on the pages of a Basil and a Gregory of Nazianzus, soon avowed their plain hostility to what they deemed the aggravated Augustinianism of the Low Church teaching, which in many quarters was still popular and prevalent. The Scripture proofs that were relied on only called sharper attention to the current principles of interpretation, and while Calvinism was denounced generally, the theories of such men as Gaussen, and of what became contemptuously called Bibliolatry, were also specially included in the denunciation, as forming the bases for an immoral system. Thinkers of this freer school thus antagonized, found but little to modify their aversions in the general principles and system of interpretation adopted by the Anglican school. Though free from any Calvinistic bias, Anglicanism was loyally staunch on the doctrine of the Atonement, and was always prepared to sustain and to press any high-toned deductions that seemed logically to be derived from it. The liberal school of thought thus not only found no sympathy from the other great party in the Church, but even met with distinct opposition from it whenever they trenched upon what were deemed by that party to be fundamental principles of the doctrine of Salvation. Nor did they meet with less opposition from the same party in all questions connected with the inspiration and supreme authority of Scripture. Though Anglicanism very wisely had forborne from putting forward any theory of inspiration, and though some leading writers of this school had expressed themselves with some freedom on the subject, still the vast majority both held and still

hold the plenary authority of Scripture in a sense which has never been accepted by the party of free handling and intuitive interpretation. Thus plainly antagonized by the sharply defined views of the earlier Evangelical party, both in reference to the doctrine of Salvation and the Scriptures, and almost as plainly repelled by the reverential precision of Anglican teaching, an important school of thought, of which it is only right to speak with respect and fairness, slowly emerged from what they themselves would call the freer consciousness of the Church, and, towards the end of the second ten years of the generation we are considering, assumed the attitude and organization of an independent party.

As is always the case with a new party, especially one that has been developed by antagonisms and consolidated by opposition, their line of action was aggressive rather than defensive. Their theology was mainly destructive in its tendencies. The constructive hints were few and vague, the oppositive element very clearly defined and prominent. The whole effort of the party was directed, and that avowedly, against authoritative declarations in matters of faith, against dogma, in fact, where declarations or dogma did not commend themselves to the religious consciousness of the individual thinker. And it must be admitted that the assault was conducted with spirit and intrepidity. The sort of under tone of indignation against what was judged to be the immoral teaching of opponents, especially in respect of some of the popular doctrines connected with freedom and grace, and with final rewards and punishments, carried younger men completely away, and even to some extent had effect on older and cooler thinkers. It may also be added that though the deep religious persuasions of opponents were by no means sufficiently respected, still the general tone of the writings of this school was high and pure. There was irritability and impatience of authority, there was a subjectivity that very frequently approached the confines of what outsiders did not scruple to call self-satisfaction and vanity; but it must be said, in all Christian fairness, there was a love of truth and a sympathy with all the *human* aspects of our Redeemer's life that won many hearts then, and has not wholly lost them now. Many of these peculiarities found expression in a remarkable and notorious volume—notorious, alas! at the very hour in

which we are writing. Though it is our distinct desire in this Essay to avoid reference to individual volumes or to individual writers, and to direct our attention as much as possible to religious thought rather than to the sources from which it has emanated, still it is hardly possible to avoid specifying and making a few comments on a volume which, under the name of *Essays and Reviews*, produced a very powerful effect on contemporary thought.

How this volume came into existence it is really not very easy to specify. That it was not the result of any distinct and deliberate design may be very safely admitted. That it was, however, nothing more than the residuum of certain Oxford and Cambridge essays, a mere aggregation of rejected essays on religious subjects, may also be as safely denied. It was the production of several cultivated minds that had much in common, and that desired, under a sort of loose form of union, to place their thoughts and speculations together in a single volume, and to take the judgment thereon of their fellow-religionists and contemporaries. Though there was no special concert, yet it is now, at any rate, perfectly clear that the general tendency of the volume was designedly opposed to the prevailing theories of inspiration, and to the finality of the authority of the Scriptures in matters of faith and practice. The authoritative was to give way to the intuitive, or, at least, to be powerfully modified by it. This was the general aim, current, and tenor of this remarkable volume; and though it may be most just and fair to limit the responsibility of each writer to his own essay and assertions, it is at the same time simply impossible not to recognise the existence of *a common principle,* and not to trace a certain amount of conscious or unconscious complicity. Had not this been the case, it would have never exercised the influence it certainly has exercised on recent religious thought. No amount of special pleading can disprove the fact that this influence has been produced (the present state of religious thought among our young men at Oxford is a sufficient illustration), and no hypothesis can satisfactorily account for it that does not assume—what is indeed on the very surface—that throughout the volume there is a steady drift of thought and argument in one direction. From the loose statements of the pioneering and insinuative essay

with which the book opens to the careful reasoning and arguments of the elaborate and powerful essay with which it closes, there is the same continuous effort to emancipate the interpretative faculty from any authoritative influence, to vindicate for the reason its full right to deal with the Bible as it would deal with any other book of equal antiquity and similar diversity of contents, and, by consequence—this is the profoundly important result,—to claim, as over against special statements and declarations, an appeal to a rectifying faculty in the mind of the intelligent reader.

Let this be well and clearly borne in mind, for this is the true *animus* of the book; this is the real reason why its teaching met with such a large acceptance; this is the secret of the impulse it has given to modern thought in reference to the ultimate authority of Holy Scripture. Each intelligent reader feels his intellectuality delicately flattered. Each claimant of liberty of thought finds that liberty vindicated more persuasively than he could have done it for himself. The unconscious fascination is hard to resist; and that it was not, and has not been resisted is a matter of simplest observation. Let us frankly say that this is not to be wondered at. No doubt the problem with which the book dealt is a very difficult one, and one that has presented itself again and again from the days of Origen down to our own,—Where is reason to stop in the interpretation of a book so diversified as the Book of Life? Are there different degrees of inspiration? and, if so, may the reason go further in interpreting the statements, say in the book of Judges, than the statements in the Acts of the Apostles? May we be more free in handling the moral assertions, say in the book of Deuteronomy, than in dealing with those in the Epistle to the Romans? and, if so, how are we also to deal with the fact that some of the assertions of the former book were used as of ultimate authority in one of the most momentous scenes in the history of the whole human race? May we be a little concessive in reference to the miracles and prodigies of the Old Testament? but, if so, how are we to deal with the fact that they are so often referred to in the New Testament, not only as historical, but as even illustrative or corroborative of the recorded words of our Lord himself? If, for example, we are disposed to gloss a little in reference to the special circumstances of the fate of Sodom and Gomorrah, or

the details of the escape of Jonah, how are we to account for the fact that one of the details of the former incident suggests an authoritative warning in the Lord's last and great prophecy, and that the other is used to illustrate the mighty miracle on which, in a certain sense, Christianity itself depends? Can we cut the knot by boldly asserting that there *are* fundamental differences between narrative and doctrine, and that, while in the former we need not look for more than substantial truth, in the latter we may rely upon each declaration as authoritative, infallible? Such an assertion is plausible, and by the nature of the case involves some elements of truth, but can it be accepted as meeting fairly all the difficulties of the trying problem? No doubt, in the historical portions we may justly and safely draw a clear distinction between formal *recollection* and true *remembrance*: we may even feel persuaded that inspiration is involved in the latter rather than the former; but how are we to deal with cases in which what we have before us is neither purely history nor purely doctrine, but something which is in form the one but really in substance the other? To take, for instance, a case in which modern thinkers of earnest and even devout minds feel the greatest conceivable difficulty,—the case of the demoniacs in the New Testament. Are we at liberty to make any doctrinal deductions from the more startling details, and apply them to the many questions connected with the dark mystery of superhuman evil? or are we to regard the whole as a narrative in which a substantial truth, viz., the supernatural power of Christ over malady and disease,—be the cause of the disease what it might,—is the only truth intended to be revealed to us?

We might easily multiply these difficult questions, but enough has been said to justify the remark that the problem with which the volume had to deal was of vast and acknowledged difficulty. But having said this, we are also justified by the whole tenor of the essays in adding that the manner in which the problem was discussed was in a high degree unsatisfactory, and frequently betrayed an *animus* that was only reconcileable with conscious prejudgment, and with a desire to state and maintain a thesis rather than to investigate the whole question. The latent thesis of the volume is really to this effect: The Bible is *not* the Word of God, but contains the Word of God,—some of the essays putting forward more strongly the negative, some the positive, but

all concurring in the same general lines of thought. The obvious conclusion is what each essay does not fail to draw, viz., that the Word of God so contained is to be discerned and distinguished by reason and enlightened conscience, or, in still plainer words, the individual is to himself the exponent of what is essential. This is the thread of the whole volume. It opens with the generalisation, made in effect long before by Lessing, that the spirit or conscience in the individual soul illumined by antecedent revelation is the third and last factor in the education of the world, and it concludes with an elaborate exemplification of it in the special province of the interpretation of Scripture.

It is not the province of this Essay to show what would seem to be the precise error in the thesis or the fallacies involved in the general conclusion. It may, however, be well to remark in passing, that the thesis is correct in the distinction it implies between the divine and human elements which coexist in the Holy Scriptures; but is incorrect in denying the mysterious interpenetration of these elements, and the resultant unity in that which, thus considered, is rightly defined as the Word of God. It is one thing to recognise the existence of the two elements, it is another thing to claim a diagnostic power which may not only separate, but rectify. The recognition of the two elements leads, by way of natural deduction and inference, to the further and more important recognition of the organic unity of the Scriptures, and enables us more completely to realise both their authority and their sufficiency. The claim laid to a rectifying faculty, and to the consequent right to use it, leads as certainly in the contrary direction. Freehandling tends to obliterate every conception of unity and continuity, and to decompose the Bible into an aggregation of treatises of varying age, character, and value, in respect of which no more reasonable account can be given why these particular treatises, and no others, should have been preserved than could be given in respect of the lost and extant portions of the histories of Livy. The latent assumption, in fact, throughout is,—that the inspiration of the Bible is really not different in kind from that animating and plastic influence that is to be traced in all the higher productions of human thought, and that thus the Bible may be dealt with like any other collection of treatises of high claims and acknowledged antiquity; whereas, the real

question at issue is this,—Is such an assumption really justifiable? Is it reconcileable with existing phenomena? Is there really only a difference in degree, and not in kind, in the inspiration to which we owe the first Pythian Ode, or 'The Merchant of Venice,' and that to which we owe the prophecies of Isaiah, or the narrative of the fourth Evangelist. Is there no such thing as distinct and peculiar qualification for a peculiar work? Can we admit, in any sense, that Apostles and Evangelists were qualified by special and singular gifts for the preaching of the Gospel, and not also admit that, when they addressed themselves to the more responsible duty of committing to *writing* what they believed and preached, they were specially qualified with similar or even higher measures of divine assistance? Surely if we recognise the divine nature of the message, we must also be prepared to recognise some providential care at least in its authoritative transmission. Is there anything inconsistent with reason, or with sober Christian philosophy (for we are Christians arguing with Christians) in maintaining, on the one hand, that divine truth was conveyed to man both orally and in writing by the instrumentality of man, and not without distinct traces of his individuality; but, on the other hand, that the individual instrument, even as Scripture, the consciousness of the Church, and religious experience, all alike, testify, was *qualified* for the work by the special agency of the Holy Ghost? Is it not the distinct and explicit teaching of Scripture (1 Cor. xii. 4) that there are "diversities of gifts," and that these gifts are bestowed or enhanced by the Eternal Spirit according to the case and the need; and must we not consider that no case could call for such a more special interposition than that of the Prophet, the Evangelist, or the authoritatively writing Apostle?

What the precise nature of the interposition may have been, and what the limits to which it extended, it may not be easy for us to define. This, however, both Scripture and the nature of the case seem clearly to indicate,—that inspiration especially showed itself in the quickened remembrance and rectified judgment; but that it extended to every minute circumstance, and to every detail of time and place, is an assertion that by no means equally commends itself to sober and reverent consideration. Perhaps, in respect of the extent to which inspiration was vouchsafed, we can only express ourselves negatively; and

remembering that it pleased God to use man, and not the members of any higher creation, as the general media of His communications to man, humbly suggest the reasonableness of the belief that the Eternal Spirit never obliterated the essential characteristics of purely truthful *human* testimony. If in more than one mysterious passage we are spoken of as "fellow workers with God," and if this co-operation in the great conflict with evil would seem to extend far beyond the limits to which average religious thought would confine it,—if this be so, it is still in our weakness, and with all the characteristics of our nature about us and upon us that we do so co-operate, though quickened with inward strength. At any rate, all deeper Scripture teaching, as we may hereafter indicate in this Essay, points in that direction. With such wider thoughts opening out upon us, we can hardly have much difficulty in the conception that the committal of the treasures of God's revealed truth to earthen vessels has not obliterated the distinctive characteristics of the highly favoured receptacles. That the power, however, has been given to us of separating the treasures from any particles of earthliness that may have been permitted, by the very nature of the case, to adhere to them, is a conception which it is much more difficult to admit, inasmuch as it is a conception which, to be logical, we ought to be prepared to extend to other cases in which the agency of man has been privileged to co-operate with the fore-ordering power and providence of God. In a word, we may often recognise the co-existence of the divine and the human; but we rarely have the power given us to define where the one begins and the other ends, still less to rectify the resultant manifestations.

But we must now return to our general subject. We have dwelt at some length upon the prevailing teaching of the remarkable volume which has elicited the foregoing comments, and we have been led to put forward, though briefly, a few countervailing remarks. And perhaps, in both cases, not improperly. The book itself certainly demands the attentive consideration of every one who would fairly estimate the direction of religious thought in this country at the present time. The Essays to which we have alluded focussed, so to speak, the yet unconcentrated thoughts that had been slowly manifesting themselves during the second decade of the period we are now

reviewing. They have demanded our attention, and at the same time have also properly called forth the corrective comments of the last two or three pages; nothing being less desirable than to specify impartially the principles and characteristics of writings designedly destructive rather than constructive, and not at the same time, however briefly, to indicate what may be said on the other side. But now we may rightly proceed onward, and trace the effects on modern thought of the opinions and statements above adverted to.

As has already been said, the two main questions that emerged most prominently from the preceding period were those affecting the doctrines of Salvation and the authority of the Scriptures. We have just noticed the views that had taken shape in reference to the latter question; it will be desirable now to notice shortly the attitude of modern thought in reference to the former question, at the commencement of the third period into which we have now entered. We may, then, endeavour to feel our way, as well as we may be able, among those more recent questions and subjects which are claiming present attention, but which all depend on, or are legitimately deducible from, the two greater questions which preceded them.

In regard of the doctrine of Salvation much less has been put forward, whether against received opinions or in support of them, than in regard of the Scriptures. The various theories of the Atonement have been freely discussed, but as yet nothing like a distinct counter-theory has been advanced. Nor is it likely that this will ever be the case. Thinkers on both sides see and feel that this great doctrine will always be conditioned and defined by the still greater doctrine of the Person of the Eternal Son, and that round that last doctrine all the controversies of the immediate future will ultimately group themselves. There is therefore, and has been for some years, in reference to the doctrine of the Atonement, a tacitly agreed-on armistice. A few treatises have appeared from time to time, but none of a character or breadth sufficient to influence contemporary thought. The current, however, has been all the time silently setting one way. All the various imputation theories of the first and second periods of our retrospect have been denounced as illogical or immoral, but nothing either logical or reasonable has been advanced to supply their place. We now

rarely hear, except from old-fashioned religionists, such terms as imputed *guilt*, forensic righteousness, or those many, or similar, expressions derived from that strange vocabulary, which the theology of a past era invented, or adopted, for setting forth the so-called legal aspects of this holy mystery. We hear also less frequently those startling, and at times even shocking, descriptions in which our dear Lord's sufferings and agonies were cumulatively set forth by the selfish speaker to his selfish hearers as affording the grounds for hope that their own would be proportionately diminished. This theology of gloom and wrath has gradually yielded to the almost indignant vigour of the attacks that have been made upon it by the school of free thought, but no theory has taken its place; no reasonable solution of the great difficulties connected with the subject has been even hinted at by either of the two remaining great parties in the Church. The great questions remain as before: What was the precise effect of the Redeemer's sufferings and death on the race generally? Was it exemplary or was it expiatory? If exemplary, was it purely so, or had it any ulterior effects, and if so, what? If expiatory, on what conditions, and to what extent was it so? Was the whole scene on Golgotha only the last act in a great moral drama, the purest manifestation of unselfishness and love?—or was it the scene of a triumph over powers of supernatural evil, and of a victory of which the specific effects may be appropriated by the individual believer, and may be pleaded till the last hour of the Lord's mediatorial reign? Was the Lord's death a part of the secret that had been sealed in silence from eternal ages, or was it something voluntarily resolved on within the limits of the history of the race, and ultimately undergone under the motions of an exhaustless love that transcends all thoughts and powers of human conception? None of these questions has been answered systematically and adequately, either by the Anglican school or by the school of free thought. All parties have apparently agreed to leave these questions, for the present, in abeyance; but that they must hereafter come into prominence is as certain as that the doctrine on which they all depend —the Nature and Person of Christ—must be one of the two or three great and lasting questions of the future.

Perhaps we may be thankful that it is so. We are as yet

hardly sufficiently able to grasp and apply the sober and comprehensive answers which the age of the Niceno-Constantinopolitan theology has long ago returned to these ultimate questions, and which in our own Church have found their expression in such writers as Bilson and Jackson. We are not able as yet popularly to appreciate or realise the distinctions between the idea of an Atonement that consisted in the simple sufferance of pain and death, and that of an Atonement that, beside death, consisted also in a perfect and lifelong obedience maintained unto, in, and through death. And we must be content to wait patiently till more practical realisations of our blessed Master's Person and Divinity enable us all more feelingly to appreciate the real nature of His work and the boundless efficacies of His Atonement. Meanwhile, our exact state in respect of the great and important domain of religious thought included under the general term of soteriology would seem to be this,—that the Calvinistic theories of a former generation have been shaken and invalidated; but that, on the one hand, no counter theories have been advanced in their place, and, on the other, that there has been no sufficient re-assertion of the sober, consolatory and comprehensive doctrines of the primitive Church and of our best earlier Anglican divines.

But though the general question thus remains in abeyance, we must not forget that modern thought has opened up several subordinate questions, either connected with the general subject itself, or with the subject as it stands related to eschatology. For instance, what thought is now presenting itself more frequently to the sympathizing and meditative heart than the future of those countless thousands in our own Christian land, for whom Christ died, but to whom the very name of Christ is unknown, save as a name that accentuates their hapless language of passion and unconscious blasphemy. Is there any one of us who can thread the by-ways of a peepled city without being forced, if he has any heart, and any thankful sense of religion in his own soul, into questions of sorrowfully profound import? "These wan and haggard beings, whose whole wretched life has been misery and sin, to whose ears no message of salvation has ever come, to whose poor hearts no accent of Evangelical hope or sympathy has ever been addressed,—these hapless children whom the ragged school has never reached,

and on whose sickly and narrowed brows the waters of baptism have never rested,—these poor outcasts of our common humanity,—these who, to use a homely phrase, have never had, and probably never will have, their chance in this world,—how will it be with them in the waiting world after death, how in the issues of the final judgment? Are there any open secrets in Scripture not yet realised? Is St. Peter, only in the judgments of theologians and interpreters, the Apostle in whose writings Hope is set forth, as Faith is by St. Paul and Love by St. John, or is there in the revelations which we find in his first Epistle a special weight and significance on which we may reverently rely? Have the two great passages in his first Epistle, especially the second of those passages, any bearing upon cases such as these? Is there here a blessed, though dimly revealed, intimation of hope for such, and *only* such, as have never heard the Lord's saving name in this world, or is to us the future of all such cases, cases that so meekly appeal to our religious sensibilities, impenetrable darkness and rayless night?"

However we may answer such questions, it is certain that modern thought has emphatically raised them, and it seems not improbable that they will take a place among the great questions of the future. And for this plain reason, that they are real and practical questions. They are permitted to give us hope for others, where we often acutely need it, and to whisper encouragement when we are brought face to face in works and embassages of Christian love to such cases as those of whom we have been thinking. Who shall say what may not be the vital and enduring effect of efforts which to our poor human judgments seem infinitesimal when contrasted with the mass of misery and evil against which they are directed? Who shall limit the developable power of Christ's name if only brought once to the hearing of the ear, and never so dimly to the cognisance of one of these poor castaway hearts? Of course there is the obvious danger that if such dim hopes as these were to find general expression, they would at once be appropriated by those who would have no right to entertain them,—and for this good and sufficient reason we may hope they never will form a part of definite Christian teaching. We have had sufficient warning in the traced-out history of such a ghastly and immoral doctrine

as the Purgatory of the Roman Church, what vast evils would certainly result from such subjects ever being dealt with except as a part of the *disciplina arcani*,—but it may be wise for us not overhastily or inconsiderately to denounce humbly entertained hopes for such classes of the hopeless as we have spoken of, when they certainly do very often supply to earnest and imaginative hearts the greatest conceivable encouragement amid seemingly fruitless labours, and in conflicts in which the Power of Evil would seem to hold enduring and irreversible mastery.

An allied but far more difficult subject was also brought into prominence during the latter part of the second period, upon which, as materially affecting and affected by modern thought, it will be necessary to make a few comments. We allude to the doctrine of the eternity of divine punishments. This profound and much controverted question reappeared in our own times principally in connection with the removal of a distinguished professor from King's College, London. After long and diversified controversy the negative opinion became so far prevalent among advanced thinkers as to hold a distinct place in the teaching of the remarkable volume which we have recently discussed, and to form one of the impugned articles of faith in the trials in which two of the Essayists were implicated five years ago. Since that time the subject has remained in abeyance, and has never yet been very fully or philosophically discussed. It came into prominence in our own times by the way of reaction against the stern tenets of the earlier Evangelical school, and, when fairly brought into discussion, united both of the great parties in the Church against the school of free thought. The earlier Anglican school had always firmly maintained the doctrine, but without that more pungent, and, alas, often denunciatory application of it which provoked the attack and embittered the controversy. In the doctrinal treatises of our great Divines, and in the most sober teaching of the primitive Church, the dread mystery of the finally averted and ultimately reprobate ever held that serious place which it will maintain to the very end. But it was always expressed in general and Scriptural terms. It was rightly felt to be shrouded in gloom and mystery, and in that ominous gloom all calmer writers had agreed to leave it. Into that gloom it has again receded. Controversy has done no more than demolish the repulsive

specialities of many current statements, but it has never succeeded in removing the dread conception that there is a final and eternal *too late*,—that *too late* which, as has been well said, forms the dark back-ground for the solemnity of life, and imparts to the present time, yea, to the very present moment, the most profound spiritual importance.

Just for the present the controversy remains in abeyance, but that it will be revived again no one can doubt. We may then very suitably use this short lull for that more calm consideration of the whole mysterious subject, which will not be in our power when antagonism and controversy recommence. Our remarks must necessarily be brief; but we may still profitably consider the question with reference both to Scripture and to Christian speculation.

When we turn to Scripture, and to the many passages which, with more or less distinctness, allude to the future of the wicked and the reprobate, it would at first seem as if it were impossible to imagine how any doubts could reasonably be entertained that the final lot of the wicked will be eternal condemnation and never-ending punishment. Those dread words, which the Judge has revealed to us that He Himself will pronounce at the hour of irreversible separation, how utterly and entirely they seem to preclude all hope; how fearfully they seem to carry with them the very reason of their own irreversibility. To be bidden to depart from Christ; to exist, yet apart from Him, and without Him; to dwell in that outer darkness where He is not, would have been a final sentence that might have left some lingering hope of a possibility of return; but to be bidden to depart, not only condemned, but—*cursed* (let the thoughtful reader weigh well all that is contained in that awful word), cursed by Him who came to bless and to save,—more, to be bidden, thus cursed, to depart unto a place and portion originally prepared for others, whose lot we instinctively associate with utter impossibility of reversal—the lost angels—thus and *thither* to be sentenced by the Saviour of the world does seem, and must seem, to every sober thinker, to involve every conception of immutability. While time lasts, as long as history has not yet closed, we may conceive the possibility of conversion; but when that *terminus peremptorius*, which every deeper conviction recognises in the Lord's Advent, is finally

come; when the side of the foe has been taken, and an alien destiny deliberately chosen; and, further, when the finally assigned place is one prepared for those with whom the lot has been cast, the conclusion seems irresistible that where lost angels are there lost man must be—for ever. The old and dread truth slowly reasserts its pertinence and significance,—*ex inferno nulla redemptio.*

When we join with this primary declaration the many other confirmatory declarations, not only in Scripture generally, but (we lay stress on this) in the recorded words of our Blessed Lord, every conclusion that we seem already to have drawn is enhanced and corroborated. When we well weigh, for example, the full force of the declaration that blasphemy against the Holy Ghost "shall not be *forgiven*, neither in this world nor in the world to come,"—or, in other words, that punishment will not be withdrawn,—when we fairly estimate all that seems necessarily involved in such an expression as "the worm that dieth not," it does seem impossible to arrive at any other conviction than this,—that wherever Scripture specially alludes to the future of the wicked, there, not merely the possibility of eternal condemnation, but conversely the impossibility, in some cases at least, of change or remission is the truth which all fair interpretation must derive from the words.

But is there not another Scriptural side of this profound subject? Certainly there is. All the group of passages which relate to the *ἀποκατάστασις*, and all those many secondary texts, such as the Apostle's declaration, that "as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall *all* be made alive" (1 Cor. xv. 22)—all such texts and passages, antecedently commending themselves as they all do to our hopes and sympathies, do so speak of the universality of redemption, and so justly exalt the sacrifice of Christ, that it seems at first a kind of sacrilege to call in question the persuasion that His love will ultimately embrace the totality of created beings. With these passages in the soul, we feel ourselves borne onward into almost boundless hopes. We seem united in sympathizing convictions with some of the noblest thinkers the world has ever known. The latent belief of some of the great Greek Fathers becomes our own; the speculations of Origen are hardly felt to be too wide. Salvation and the limitless efficacies of Christ's sacrifice fill the whole field

of spiritual vision, and we seem strangely but irresistibly led by inspired words to a conclusion exactly the reverse of that to which the words of the same inspiration had already guided us.

What, then, are we to say? Are we, with some thoughtful writers, to recognise here what is called an antinomy, and simply to assert that though we know and believe that Scripture cannot contradict itself, yet that no satisfactory solution has been vouchsafed of the difficulty, and that, by the very nature of the case, none is to be looked for on this side the grave, and with the present limitations of human knowledge? Are we, with many pious writers, not only to recognise the antinomy, but even to acknowledge the manifest wisdom of God in having withheld the solution while we are thus in the stream of time and development? What are we to say? Perhaps this;—that though, as we shall soon see, mere speculation may seem to lead us up to some such antinomy, yet that this is not the case with Scripture, there being an appreciable preponderance in favour of the former set of conclusions as compared with and as over against the latter. First, because the former revelations have a *special* character and a special reference to the case of those under consideration; whereas the latter are general and comprehensive, and may not unreasonably be conceived to reveal no more than a general truth, subject to such limitations or exceptions as the nature of the case must be understood to introduce. In other and simpler words, the restitutional passages may refer only to what, by the nature of the case, is capable of restitution. They really may say no more than this,—that all that is saveable will be saved. Secondly, as has often been pointed out, they actually contain some expressions of limitation. It is simply contrary to all true principles of interpretation to ignore such clauses as "*in* Christ" or "*by* Christ" (Eph. i. 11, Col. i. 19) in some of the cardinal statements in reference to the *ἀποκατάστασις*. Thirdly, in none of the passages does there appear to be the faintest allusion to any possibility of restoration for the lost members of the angelical world. When, then, we find, as we do find, lost men and lost angels described as involved in a common destiny and prison-house (Matth. xxv. 41, Rev. xx. 10, 14, 15), we cannot without much arbitrariness imagine a final exemption for the one when no trace of such a hope exists for the other, and when the very

companionship would seem to involve an identity of final destiny. Is it easy to conceive a restitution after such a companionship, and when time has ceased to be, and history concluded? We do, then, feel from these considerations that on the appeal to Scripture it must in fairness be conceded that it is not a case of simple antinomy, but that there is a logical and appreciable preponderance in favour of those passages which *deal specially with the subject,* and refer expressly to the future condition of the wicked.

It is perhaps somewhat otherwise when we pass into the realm of thought and speculation. There, it may be admitted, we do seem ultimately to arrive at an antinomy. If we consider the mysterious question on the data supplied by the facts and experiences of life, when taken in connection with the fundamental articles of Christian belief, we arrive slowly but certainly at the conclusion,—that there is a time after which nothing remains but remorse and fruitless retrospect, and when repentance has become impossible simply because the conditions, under which alone we can conceive repentance possible, have ceased to exist. Time is no more; history has closed; probation, which it is simply impossible for us to conceive as independent of time and history, is over; it has become *too late;* and as long as consciousness remains, the consciousness that it *is so* forms the whole sentiency of being, and makes up that which Scripture defines as the second death,—ever-enduring, self-conscious death. As we have before said, while time remains and until history is closed we may conceive change and conversion as possible, but when history is over and the mediatorial reign is come to its end, then changelessness and irreversibility are the only conceptions that on this, the anthropological side of the subject, we can form or realise. Change or development is simply unrealisable when those elements and conditions which, as far as all human experience confirmed by Scripture goes to show, are essential to its existence, have utterly ceased to exist. There is, as it would seem, only one escape possible, and that is the conception that self-consciousness may at last itself no longer exist, that individual being may cease to be, and that personality may become dissipated in the everlasting night of annihilation. But against this conception, if any one will carefully sound his innermost persuasions, every instinct (we have no better word)

of our being tacitly protests; while we *are* we can never fully accept the possibility of a ceasing to be. Scripture gives no warranty for such a belief, and, as we shall see when we consider the whole question on the God-ward side and in connection with the divine purpose, the difficulties on that side of the question are in no degree whatever relieved by it. It is a solution that at first sight seems to commend itself. There is something in the idea of evil and wickedness wearing themselves out by their own inherent antagonisms that may win a passing assent. There are also isolated expressions in Scripture, such as ἀπωλεία, which, if we detach the passages where they occur from subordination to the general analogy of Scripture may *seem* to point that way. It may also be noted that some recent theological writers of the highest order, such, for instance, as Plitt (in his *Evangelische Glaubenslehre*) have avowedly leant towards this belief, and it is by no means improbable that current thought will tend more in the same direction; but be this as it may, this solution will never stand the test of reasoning based on Scripture and experience, and never will be found, in any candid mind, *ultimately to satisfy.*

We have seen, then, that reasoning on the anthropological side leads us to the belief in the eternity of a state which has ever been deemed to involve the most dread conception of penal remorse, of "the worm that dieth not." When, however, we turn to the God-ward side, and to all the conceptions that are connected with the doctrine of the purposes of divine love, we, no doubt, are led step by step to a reversed conclusion, especially when we consider the Scripture statements in reference to the restitution of all things. When, for instance, we bring into the mental field of view, on the one hand, the idea of the exhaustless love of God, and of the holy and eternal purpose which was conceived by love, and of which love is the essence and animating principle, and, on the other hand, Scripture's most solemn declaration that when the end is finally come, "God will be all in all," it seems almost impossible to imagine that any human soul will be able to resist that love, or cease to be the object of it. Yes, we need not be ashamed to confess it. When we are reasoning on this side of the subject, it does seem all but inconceivable that when God is thus all in all, there should still be some dark spot in the universe where, amid

endlessly self-inflicted suffering, or in the enhancements of ever-enduring hate, rebel hands should for ever and for ever be raised against the Eternal Father and the God of everlasting love. We may endeavour to rectify our conceptions by the remembrance that God is a God of justice, and that if we would presume to reason or speculate, we must not fix our attention on a single attribute, but see it in co-existence with the rest; we may wisely apply this homely but salutary corrective to our meditations, but, if we would frankly own the truth, whenever we thus speculate from the conception of the love of God, we are led to something very nearly the reverse of that at which we arrived when starting from the side of anthropology, and the facts and characteristics of human life. There is no alleviation of the difficulty in adopting the annihilation theory to which we have already alluded; for when thus insisting on the omnipotence of this love, to have still to admit that there are those whom it does not reach, or who are at last abandoned by it, is to find ourselves in an antinomy quite as marked as that which has already presented itself. The only consideration which may lead us to doubt the complete soundness of our ground is this,—that if we thus reason from the love of God and the divine purpose, we must remember that we cannot logically stop with the human race, but be prepared to go to the full lengths of Origen's speculations, and that thus we shall ultimately find ourselves in antagonism with the fundamental truth that the Advent of the Lord brings with it the final judgment and closes time and history. If after the Lord has come "to judge the quick and the dead," conversion or moral development be possible for fallen angels or reprobate man, then the last judgment will not be final.

This reflection may, lastly, lead us to the homely conclusion that it may be more unsafe than we think to speculate on the basis of the assumed purposes of divine love; and that though the ardent, the pure, the loving, and the chivalrous will latently so speculate, or at any rate so hope, until the end, yet that calm and cool reason leads us to these plain and sober considerations:—First, that the balance of Scripture teaching would seem to be clearly in favour of the darker view. Secondly, that the mysterious law known by the general name of the Enhancement of Sin in the individual, and so powerfully sketched out by Müller

and others, points the same way. Thirdly, that though we seem led to an antinomy, when we speculate on the one side from life and facts, and on the other, from the final purpose of divine love; yet, as in the one case, we are speculating on the basis of what we know and observe—almost on the basis of experience—and as in the other our speculations are in a realm which, by the nature of the case, lies quite beyond us, it must be the commonest prudence, at any rate, to live and act on the former set of deductions rather than on the latter. Fourthly, that if man shall have so sundered himself from the stock of his humanity as to have joined himself with those against whom he was presumably called into being to contend, then it is but reasonable to believe that his lot will be eternally the same as that of those with whom he has so joined himself.

We may now pass onward in our survey. Hitherto we have considered opinions and views of Christian doctrine which had either obtained currency in the period immediately preceding the present, or had come into such clear prominence at the close of it as to have found distinct expression in the *Essays and Reviews*. We now come to views and opinions connected with a much more serious doctrine than any we have yet noticed,—we allude to the Divinity of our Lord and Master Jesus Christ. These opinions may be considered to have reappeared in modern thought in this country, more immediately in sequence to the opinions that have become prevalent in reference to the authority of the Holy Scriptures. Free handling of the Word of God has introduced the Socinianism, and, we fear, the widely spreading Socinianism, of the present time. This was foreseen by many speculators. It was urged by the writer of this Essay at the commencement of this present period that such a sequel was inevitable. Sober thinkers made distinct preparation for what they saw very close at hand. The earlier and better movements of the Ritualistic School were unconsciously quickened by such anticipations. It was indeed a very easy forecast. No one who had the slightest experience could doubt what would be the logical results of the peculiar invalidation of the authority of Scripture which our own times had introduced. Some few writers, either in episcopal charges or current essays, expressed their doubts as to the probable correctness of such anticipations. Some, indeed, were such optimists as to express the belief that

the early phases of doubt at the beginning of the present period would only be transitory, and to imply that the heresies of our own day have "created an alarm quite disproportioned to their real weight and substance."* But the results have dispelled all these illusions. Logic has run on its foreseen course. If there was so much in Scripture that the cultivated conscience or the devout reason could only regard as due to the erroneous views of the writer or of the age to which he belonged, then what opinion could be formed of the frequent appeals in the New Testament to the facts of the miracles of the Old Testament? What could be said of our Lord's references,—especially some of those momentous references to which allusion has already been made in this Essay? There were only two possible answers. Either our Blessed Lord, Himself knowing the exact truth, accommodated himself to the current views of the age and people in which he vouchsafed to appear; or, He was so perfectly man and so imperfectly God as not to be able to separate the real from the mythical, and had so large a share of human imperfection as not to know that some portions of the earlier narratives to which He solemnly referred had no real foundation of fact to rest upon. The modern thinker was in a dilemma. If he adopted the former view, he would have to concede seriously in reference to the perfect morality of the Great Teacher; if he fell back on the latter, large concessions in reference to the Divinity of Christ and the union of the two Natures were logically inevitable. A few thinkers, at the beginning of the period, seemed inclined to maintain the accommodation theory, but the great majority found their sentiments expressed in the preface to the first part of Bp. Colenso's work on the Pentateuch, and unhesitatingly declared for the more Socinian theory.

Free handling of the written Word of God has thus introduced into our own times a free handling of the nature of the living and eternal Word, really far more repulsive than the early Arian views, and in some respects even more dangerous than the original teaching of Socinus. And for this plain reason. Arians and Socinians always based their opinions on the Scripture. What they found there, that they abided by. Scripture was

---

* Charge of Bishop of Lincoln for 1864, p. 50.

their court of ultimate appeal; and though reason might misinterpret, reason was never permitted to correct and to patronise. For example, to take a comparatively favourable case, Which is probably the more hurtful to a young mind, with reference to our Lord's person and work, to find our Lord represented, as the first writer in the *Essays and Reviews* represents Him, as the Example of the world rather than the Saviour of it, or to read the deductions of Socinus from the celebrated passage in the Epistle to the Philippians? In the one case all those aspects of the Lord's relations to the race, which stand in closest logical connection with the Divinity, are withdrawn into the background, while that which is, by the nature of the case, the most humanitarian is placed in the foreground. In the other case the reader has, at any rate, the words of an Apostle before him as well as the comments of the interpreter, and even while reading those comments is taught by the very stress they lay upon the isolated declarations of Scripture, to reverence still more the Book from which they are taken.

This free handling of our Lord's life has advanced recently to very dangerous lengths, and, it cannot be denied, has met with very general reception among the intellectual and the cultivated. Whether this is due to some sort of dreadful pessimism lurking in the dark background of a self-satisfied spirit, that unconsciously sympathizes with this bringing down of an ideal to a lower and more accessible level, or whether it is due to some wider intellectual movement that is now everywhere affecting and influencing modern thought, may not be very easy for us to decide. The phenomenon is distinctly to be recognised; the causes may be so subtle as to defy present analysis. At any rate, we may discard the once popular solution of the question which referred all to the imported license of German thought. We may have derived, doubtless, much from our more recent intellectual contact with that land of deep but sometimes nebulous thought, but in the particular subject we are now considering,—and it is for many reasons a very serious fact,—our free thought and free handling of the Gospel narrative is of native growth, and has spread among us from the earlier movements to which we have already called attention.

We have an instructive instance of the prevalence of these lowered views of our Lord's life and works, in a work that two

or three years ago attracted an almost unprecedented amount of attention,—we mean, of course, the anonymous volume that bears the truthful and significant title *Ecce Homo.* Renan's work had appealed comparatively to few,—though, by the way, a much more learned work, and one much less calculated to do lasting mischief. There was about it a French sentimentality that repelled the English reader even more than the mythicism and ideology of Strauss. But in the work above mentioned, modern English thought in reference to our Lord's Life found itself most clearly and felicitously reflected. There was just the infusion of Socinianism, not a drop in excess, that could be gratefully assimilated; just that amount of the hero-lowering process which flattered without startling the modern thinker; just that frank recognition of ultra-human excellence which reassured any disturbed sensibility. It was essentially the book of three years ago, and a remarkably useful index of the amount and direction of the drift of thought in reference to Christology. That it has produced no effect on the thought of which it is the mere index need hardly be added. It is a book that may in many respects be compared with the once notorious *Vestiges of Creation,* the book of a mere epoch, the intelligent epitome of current thoughts; just the book to read, to be interested in, to be delicately flattered by, and to forget.

But the reception of such a book is a very monitory sign of the "whither" of modern thought in reference to the fundamental doctrine of Christianity. The sharp outline of the Nicene definitions of our Master's Divinity are giving way to the continuous and solvent action of more recent religious speculation. A refined Socinianism is now the perceptible characteristic of the more thoughtful articles in our higher class journals. A decorous recognition of the holy and the chivalrous in that blessed Life is now rarely wanting. The current is smooth, the surface is unruffled, but it is the calm and the smoothness that is often the result of the swiftness of the downward sweeping waters, and only too frequently reminds us of what may lie ominously beyond.

A few years ago it was different. In the first turbid movements of free enquiry and free handling that marked the commencement of the present third period, there was much that was calculated to give pain and offence. The tone of some of

our popular organs of modern thought was such as to call out strong expressions of protest and of not undeserved reprehension. There were many symptoms, too, of the prevalence of immoral doubt, or in other words, of a scepticism that maintained what was its obvious interest to hope was true. There was a display of antagonism to the Nicene theology which was as inconsiderate as it was sometimes coarse and embittered. Men were charged with holding, from professional instincts or self-interest, what they did not really believe, and of denouncing in others what they themselves secretly felt to be true. Of course all this provoked sharp rejoinders. Charity suffered, and the truth was not advanced. But now, thank God, all this is very different. The stream of modern religious thought has run much clearer, and freed itself from many of its first impurities. The tone of religious doubt and difficulty is more reverent and more tolerant; the morality that is popularly advocated, more clearly defined, and sometimes even more approximately evangelical; the results arrived at less inconsistent with the truths of Scripture and revelation. There is now a large and increasing class of deeply earnest men, with whom it is impossible not warmly to sympathize, who with acute perceptions, highly cultivated minds, and a clearly defined earnestness, are seeking, aye, with prayers, for some solution of the inscrutable problems that present themselves. The three old and ever-recurring questions, Whence, Why, Whither, are reoccupying their proper positions in the mind, and predisposing the individual thinker to give a more respectful consideration to the old answers that Scripture and experience have always been found ready to return. Even the last subject we have noticed, the Divinity of our Lord, is more tenderly dealt with. There are many now who have earnestly felt their way as far as the Resurrection, and are holding to it as a cardinal truth, even though they may be unable to accept the literal truth of many of the miracles, especially those connected with demoniacal possession, or to grasp the momentous doctrine of the union of the two perfect Natures in the person of the Lord Jesus Christ. What is even more remarkable, that doctrine which of all others met, till very lately, not only with oppugnancy but with contempt,—the doctrine of the existence of an external Evil Will and Personality, and of the culmination of wickedness in a single Being of frightful power and malignity,

has of late been considered not wholly at variance with the results of experience, and with some, at least, of the more startling phenomena of life and facts.

Such librations of opinion are interesting and observable. So observable, that it may be worth while to devote a few sentences to a consideration of the influences that have led to these modifications, where modification was least to be expected. We have not to look far or to speculate very deeply. That which, no doubt, has exercised the strongest and most salutary influence on current opinion has been the earnestness with which Church principles have been carried out into general practice. The evident reality of the convictions that have prompted and animated the various efforts that have been made to bring a religion based on the old Nicene faith home to the hearts of the people, has evidently produced a great effect on fair and reasonable men. The evident sincerity, the unflinching self-denial, the absence of all mere partisan zeal, which have marked Christian labour, especially in our great cities, have manifestly in these latter days, as in the early ages of Christianity, led many to pause, and to enquire whether there must not be deep truth in a message so earnestly and so faithfully delivered. The simple fact of this revival of Christian energy, in the old direction and in the propagation of old truths, has been permitted by the Holy Ghost to commend the truth to many who would otherwise have never been predisposed to receive it. At any rate, it has caused modern thinkers to stand at gaze. The simple fact, to give a striking example, that at the very time these lines are being written preparations have been made for a widespread pre-Advent mission in London, is a fact that will probably produce more effect on the minds of the observant and the speculative than could have been produced by the most animated defences of the Faith or the most lucid demonstrations. The feeling in every candid mind is, that there must be some reality behind these things, and that reasonable men could hardly so speak and so labour in a time of such mental development as the present, unless, after all, the course of this world was something far other than mere drift on the one hand, or mere development on the other.

Thought, therefore, would seem, to some extent at least, to be undergoing modification, owing to the silent influence of

Christian self-devotion and the earnestness of Christian practice. And this, too, be it remembered, under partially unfavourable circumstances; not an unimportant section of those who of late years have taken a forward part in evangelical labours, and have certainly produced effects on classes hitherto inaccessible, being composed of men either of little or of reactionary learning. Men whose writings, with one single and brilliant exception, have added nothing whatever to the treasury of modern thought, whose exegesis has commonly been studiously retrogressive and mediæval, and whose sermons have often been either merely mystical or merely denunciatory, have, notwithstanding, by force of earnest labour, succeeded in taking their full share in that sort of arresting process which is now going on, and which is certainly among the most striking and encouraging phenomena of the present epoch.

But let no one trust to this further than as being a cheering hint, that if advantage be taken of this sort of pause the principles of the Catholic faith may yet reassert their sway over the minds of the intellectual and the cultivated. The present is, as will hereafter be more clearly seen, one of great crisis. There is a temporary predisposition, on the one hand, for the reasons to which we have just alluded, to give a hearing to the Nicene theology, *if it be competently and intelligently stated*; but there is, on the other hand, a steady drift towards Socinianism, or, what is euphemistically called, a widening of the basis of the National Church. And, as very recent events have shown, the dissensions between the two extreme parties in the Church are such and so embittered as to make such a result seem more desirable to both than the maintenance of old principles, if it should seem likely, by such maintenance, that one religious party might ultimately gain some transitory advantage over the other. It would seem as if both parties were unwise enough to think that they could leave with impunity common positions undefended, and yet hold their own as before; whereas the steady set of theological opinion is towards a free-handled Bible, and to a free-handled Church to which neither party could conscientiously belong. We are not so far distant from the time as many may think when deliberate attempts will, at any rate, be made to open the Church to all who may be willing to accept the Ten Commandments and the Apostles' Creed as the basis for

Christian union. That such attempts, even if only partially successful, would end in rupture, final and irremediable, no one who knows the high temper of the Anglican party in reference to *credenda* can doubt for one moment. Even the removal of the Athanasian Creed will not be effected without considerable strain and risk. That there would be rupture then is certain, and that the Church party would ultimately adjust differences and consolidate in a firm and compact body on the basis of the Nicene Theology, is also scarcely less certain; but it is, on the other hand, not to be doubted that a large, loosely-connected, but intellectual body of men would linger round the ruins, reconstruct as far as might be possible, and co-operate in the maintenance of an Erastianised and Socinianised Establishment. Free thought knows well the secret that, to be elastic and effective, and properly to realise its own freedom, it must have round it the compressive forces of a religious community. Without these it loses its self-consciousness and dissipates into mere license and infidelity.

We seem, then, gradually led to these two very serious conclusions in reference to the immediate present:—*First*, that modern thought is tending towards subtle forms of Socinianism. There are now numbers who are feeling gradually their way towards the views of Schleiermacher in reference to the Incarnation, and who are also honestly unable to resist the force of the evidence for the Resurrection, but who stop there, and leave the ulterior problem unsolved, or else, if they are more speculative and intellectual, accept the theory of a deification of the man Jesus Christ, raise Him on the highest pedestal of humanity, and see in Him the point of union of the race hereafter,—and nothing more. There are even strange efforts to build up a sort of Trinitarian doctrine, *a parte post*, if we may so express ourselves, but as yet they have hardly assumed sufficiently defined speculative forms to invite analysis. They owe their origin to the honest recognition of the philosophically profound idea of God which is maintained in the Nicene conception of three co-eternal and co-equal Persons in the unity of one Godhead, and to the conviction that a mere blank monotheism comes seriously into collision with recent philosophical conceptions in reference to personality which have every appearance of ultimate truth. The philosophy of Hegel and Schelling has,

in many minds, been the flickering taper that has been permitted to guide along the dark labyrinth of thought towards the central truths of the Gospel.

Secondly, we seem to have been led to the general conclusion that the present is a time of most mysterious significance; that there would seem to be a pause in the downward sweep of thought; a real willingness to give an attentive hearing to the cardinal positions of the Nicene faith, if defined clearly and philosophically, and without that "sacerdotal dogmatism" which so commonly irritates and antagonizes. The warmth and energy of the practical Christian life of the present time has predisposed all fair and candid minds, to the unconscious admission that such reality must have deep truth to rest upon, and they frankly want to give a hearing to that truth. They are even seeking for *sympathizing* exponents of it. They know well the struggles through which they have passed; they feel proudly and sensitively the reality of the love they bear to the truth; and they are as ready to welcome the aid of the devout intellectual believer, of the man who can *really* give an account of the faith that is in him, as they are prompt in haughtily repelling either the condescensions or the attacks of the ordinary shallow dogmatist.

What, then, is the duty of all earnest Christian thinkers at this most momentous time, and with these two grave conclusions before us? Are we to join those who are labouring to widen the basis of our National Church, to put a neutral wash over the distinctness of her doctrines, and to enlarge her terms of comprehension? Are we to favour the modern tendency to regard the teaching of pure morality as the first duty, and the teaching of the Gospel as only secondary and supplemental? Are we to join the unsectarian party in educational matters, and leave religious opinions as specialities which no intelligent theories of education could be required to include; or are we, in our attempt to avoid this danger, to run into the other and equally great danger of prescribing nothing more for our National School teaching than a mere de-sacramentalised residuum of Christian doctrine, which would soon come to be considered as the maximum to be required for membership in the National Church? Are we to adopt these views, or any modifications of them, or are we to attempt the higher and

nobler work of showing to inquiring and anxious minds not only the truth (for this, at first, they might be unable fully to apprehend) but the reasonableness and really deep philosophy of the Nicene Theology? Is it not now our especial duty to endeavour to disclose those deep underlying principles of revealed biblical truth on which the whole superstructure of our *credenda* solidly rests? Is it not the proper time for recurring to ultimate questions,—the Whence, the Why, and the Whither, to which we have already alluded,—and of considering the answers that Christianity has given to them, and of contrasting them with the answers or the no answers that have been given by the most attractive or the most philosophical of modern systems of thought? In a word, is not the duty now imposed upon us, by the intellectual necessities of the times, of attempting, at any rate, so to state old truths, so to exhibit their reality, their depth, and their interdependence, as to win, by the blessed aid of the Holy Ghost, that assent to them which is withdrawn or withheld when they are presented to the speculative thinker in their usually detached and dogmatic forms?

No doubt this *is* our work and our duty. But it is a very difficult one. It was not easy to put Scriptural exegesis on a sound and safe basis, but this is a far, far more difficult undertaking. It requires the presence of two things which are not often found together: a thorough acquaintance with speculative philosophy, and an accurate knowledge of the history and details of Christian dogmatics. The truth is, we have far too much neglected the study of systematic theology in this country. Our two really great dogmatical works—those connected with the honoured names of Pearson and Jackson—show clearly enough what English learning, and especially what English moderation and good sense, can do in this difficult province of theology, but neither of these great works can be considered sufficient for the necessities of our own times. What we have had since their time have been treatises on the Articles of the Church, of more or less merit and usefulness; but, in the first place, the writers of these treatises have had no knowledge whatever of speculative philosophy, and have rarely, if ever, touched upon the difficulties felt by modern thinkers; and, in the second place, there has been no attempt even so to rearrange the Articles and the comments on them as to preserve

something like an orderly and systematic development of Christian doctrine. The truth is, our Thirty-nine Articles, as the Patriarch of Constantinople has but lately felt, cannot be considered as a carefully-constructed Confession of Faith. They never professed to be so. They are Articles of singular wisdom and moderation, specially designed to conciliate and to hold the balance; but to use them as they have been used, both by writers and students, as a sort of body of Divinity when, as our Oriental critic justly observes, they leave almost untouched several momentous subjects, is simply to misuse them, and to expose them to much of the undeserved contempt with which they have been treated by modern religionists. A true and intelligent system of Christian dogmatics would follow the line of doctrinal connection marked out in the Nicene Creed (the most scientific of our Continental theologians have returned back again to the relations and ramifications of the old paths), and would place our Articles in the proper positions, which such a course would prescribe. They would then be important illustrations of great principles, and would assume their rightful attitude as sober and weighty declarations of the Church of England, both on cardinal questions and on such other and more subordinate questions as history from time to time had brought into prominence. We should then secure some knowledge of what we have so grievously overlooked, the connections and interdependences of Christian doctrine. The student, to use a homely expression, would know where he was in the wide province of dogmatics. The doctrine of the three Persons of the Blessed Trinity, of superhuman evil, of man's nature, of salvation and of the last things, would all occupy their proper relative positions in the mind; their vital connection would be felt and realised, and dogma would be seen in its true relations to thought and history.

We have thus a most difficult work before us, and it must be frankly owned that there would seem to be very few among us who could hopefully attempt it. And yet it is exactly that which is needed for this strange and probably eventful period into which we are now passing. Let Christian doctrine only be boldly, clearly, and deeply set forth, and it will now be accepted. Each Christian thinker has now his opportunity, let him not be slow to use it: each earnest man who feels he has

his message, let him not be slow to deliver it. There are thousands and tens of thousands of waiting hearts, craving to believe, hungering after something better than their own doubts and negations, listening with almost passionate interest to anything that might even for a moment assume the most shadowy form of an answer to their deep soul-questions, and turning away with a sorrow and depression that no words can describe, when the shadowy answer recedes into the tomb of common religious platitudes, or of wonted but safe conventionalisms.

Surely, Christian doctrine, if it is what we know it to be—revealed truth—can be set forth in a manner to attract and to edify. Men, with all their failings, love light and truth, and if light and truth be now presented with anything like sympathy and intelligence, they will be welcomed more warmly than ever. But there must be *sympathy.* There must be a knowledge not only of the question itself but of the peculiar difficulties in connection with it that modern thought has introduced. Each difficulty must have presented itself sharply and clearly to the mind of the teacher; it must have received its solution from the depth of his own religious experience, and, so solved, must be stated calmly and persuasively to others. Such statements, with the aid of the Holy Ghost, will never be made in vain. Sympathy there must be; knowledge there must be; speculation there must be. Speculation; our reader starts—but speculation, especially in such times as the present, speculation, derived solely from Scripture, and restrained within sober and reverent bounds, will probably win back more souls to the Catholic faith from among modern thinkers than any other form of Christian teaching. For what, after all, is Christian speculation? What is it but the humble effort to feel out the links between great doctrinal truths, to set forth their mysterious sequence, and, from the blessed hints afforded by the Word of God, to answer more fully the questions that our own widening experiences, or the drift of the times in which we are living, bring home almost daily to our thoughts. Has the reader ever deliberately set himself to analyze the answers that have been made to such a vital question, a question so relating to Christian life and practice as, Why was I born? and then settled on his own answer—if so, he will know what we mean by Christian speculation.

Shall we close this paper with a few pages of it? Shall we detain the reader a few minutes with some scattered thoughts that have been found suggestive and helpful in considering and dealing with modern difficulties? Well, perhaps it may be imprudent; and yet perhaps it may be useful—useful, at any rate, in illustrating the connection and interdependence of Christian doctrine. So let the lines be traced. These thoughts have helped many; they may help the reader to whom now they shall be briefly presented.

When our mind bears us backward into the depths of the Eternity *a parte ante,* it rests on two blessed and adorable mysteries, the Holy and Undivided Trinity and the counsel "sealed in silence in the depths of eternal ages." When we draw near in humility to the devout consideration of the first mystery thus isolated from subsequent manifestations in time and history, we find ourselves in the highest realm of thought to which the mind of man can ascend. We have before us the mystery of the essential relations to each other of the Divine Persons, the Christian conception of the One God. In the history of the Church and the world we are brought almost entirely in connection with what are called the economical relations; here the soul is contemplating the Triune ontology. Mighty mystery, yet not more mighty than convincing and soul-satisfying. The Eternal Father through the Eternal Son creating the totality of things, and by the operation of the Holy Ghost energizing and perfecting them: immanence, emanence, and retrocession. Such is the Christian conception of Him "who dwelleth in the light which no man can approach;" such the teaching of the Scriptures and the Church as over against the Arianism or Sabellianism of earlier or later times. Let the speculative thought only rest calmly on this conception, and nearly all the baffling questions relating to self-consciousness and personality recede into the background. We recognise the eternal distinction between the created and uncreated self-consciousness, and we slowly perceive that the very idea of God involves in itself the conception of three eternal personalities, each expressing by itself the entire essence, united in the blessed unity of one Godhead of eternal knowledge, wisdom, power, and *love.* God is love, and that love reveals itself in a three-fold personality, and can only be realised by us and

experimentally known by us through this medium. In a word, as has been well said, "Christianity is the perfect revelation of the love of God: it is opposed, on the one hand, to the Deistic conception which ever places a yawning chasm between God and the creature, and the Pantheistic conception which mingles and blends them."*

If we start from this conception, and pass in thought to the second mystery—the eternal counsel, the "mystery hid in God," as the Apostle speaks of it (Eph. iii. 9), we instinctively perceive that this was a mystery of love, and had love for its purpose and animating principle. And what the spirit anticipates the Scripture reveals; the eternal counsel embraced the whole redemptive work of Jesus Christ. But here we pause; wide speculative questions of profound moment now present themselves to the thoughts. Did this silence-sealed purpose refer alone to the redemptive work of Christ on earth, or did it involve much beside? If it only referred to the redemption and death of Christ, then we become inevitably involved in the conception that the advent of the Lord resulted solely from the sin of the world, and that the Lord's manifestation is but a means to an end, and not, as all our higher feelings seem to prompt us to believe, its own purpose and end. Can, however, we take unreservedly the wide view of Osiander, and of the many great thinkers that have followed him, and maintain the belief that Christ "would have been incarnate if Adam had not sinned," and that His personal manifestation had primal reference to that ultimate bringing to perfection and summing up of all things in Himself of which Scripture presents so many important notices? Are we to deem that this, rather than the narrower view, is the truer conception of the silence-sealed purpose? Nearly our whole speculative system depends on, and will be conditioned by, our answer. What are we to say? Why, perhaps this,—that though the second view relieves us of the difficulty of the *felicissima culpa* which, according to the first view, the sin of Adam would have assumed, yet that, if by "incarnate" we are to understand such an entry into the world by human birth as He actually vouchsafed to make, we find ourselves involved in many serious

---

* Martensen, *Die christliche Dogmatik*, § 52, p. 96. (Berlin, 1856.)

speculative difficulties, and—what is ever a safe guide in these profound questions—our highest religious feelings and instinctive perceptions all opposed to such a view.

And yet, as we see from the great chapter in the third book of Irenæus (chap. xvi.), the early Church laid the greatest weight on the cosmical relations of the Lord's advent, and conceived that nothing less could be deemed to be the mind of Scripture. Nay, we feel ourselves at once yielding to the gravity of the arguments. May it not then be possible so to combine the two views as humbly to believe, on the one hand, that the Lord might have been pleased to have assumed the realities of humanity (as in the recorded theophanies of the Old Testament), even if Adam had not fallen, thus to lead him and all creation from perfection to perfection; but, on the other hand, that the incarnation under its limiting conditions of human birth, human development, and human (physical) weakness, was, equally with the atoning death, for man's salvation. Such a conception certainly throws some light upon the recorded appearances of God in the earlier books of the Bible; in every one of which (as Bull has abundantly shown in the opening chapters of his greatest work) the Ante-Nicene Fathers ever recognised the manifestation not of the First but of the Second Person of the ever-blessed Trinity. Such a conception also rightly maintains that which all the great teachers of the earliest Church, as well as our greatest living divines, have never failed to insist upon, the all-embracing cosmical relations of the manifestation of Christ, and the mightiness of the mighty purpose, which as the Apostle solemnly specifies, "God made in *Christ Jesus*" (Eph. iii. 11).

We may now more safely advance onward. We hold the real clue—the eternal significance of the one Mediator. We advance, and we find ourselves at the true, though mysterious commencement of all moral history; we find ourselves contemplating the first recorded lapse in a world of blessedness and perfection. Scripture tells us clearly enough, and in more than one passage, that in a creation antecedent in time and dignity to our own, there was a falling away and apostacy which brought with it an eternal loss of first estate, and a detrusion from the realms of blessedness to those lower regions which Scripture, in language remarkably specific, describes as the

present haunt and abiding-place of the spirits of evil. We are even told how they fell. Pride, or as, perhaps, we may presume to understand the word, self-complacent contemplation of the excellences of the creature rather than self-forgetting adoration of the Creator,—in a word, *selfishness* in its most sublimated form,—brought about the lapse, and even showed its fearful nature in conflict and defiance. One moment, older divines, such as Pearson and others, tell us was given for the final choice: the "elect angels" stood, and will for ever stand; the rebel angels fell, and will for ever remain fallen. Such is the distinct intimation of Scripture relative to the first emergence of sin. Speculative philosophy sees in it nothing but what is consistent with many observed moral and even physical phenomena; religious reflection recognises with awe the outward manifestation of the reality of that *posse peccare*, from which it cannot conceive free but created beings metaphysically dissociable. We seem justified, then, in considering this as the true epoch to which all speculations connected with sin and its consequences may be safely referred. And so many an investigator of the secrets of nature has felt humbly confident, when, in the very crust of the earth on which we tread, amid frightful indications of death and ruin, he has seemed to read hints of histories far anterior to our own. But we do not press such things, though we may justly invite the honest sceptic to take all such thoughts into consideration before he passes his judgment on the revelations of Scripture in reference to sin, suffering, and death. What we only desire to insist upon is this, that current religious thought, by referring the commencement of sin and sinful history to Adam's disobedience, has greatly darkened all true conceptions of sin, creation, and redemption. In a word, Sin had a history, and a very fearful history, before man came into being. What relations the primal purpose may have had to this as well as to the later lapse, we will not attempt to develop. That there *were* relations Scripture seems dimly to hint; but we may add no more: our shoes are on our feet, and we are treading on holy ground.

This view of sin and sinful history was that which was almost universally taken by all the great thinkers of the early Church. With some of them it was the sole basis for all their higher speculations on anthropology, and those singularly elevating

and ennobling conceptions in regard of the original purpose of man's creation which we find so frequently in the patristic writings both of the East and the West, and to which Anselm has given such prominence in his great treatise on the Incarnation. These we may profitably pause to notice, as they certainly supply answers to several ultimate questions, and are also not only consonant with the general tenor of Scripture, but supply, in some passages, very striking explanations of long-recognised difficulties.

The speculations to which we allude are those which connect the creation of man with this lapse in the angel world of which we have been speaking. It was the reverent belief of these early thinkers that man was called into being to fill up the places of the lapsed angels, that he was thus formed, as we read in the early pages of the inspired narrative, out of the dust and constituent parts of this earth with which these fallen powers certainly retained some connection, and, on the other hand, that into his nostrils was breathed the *neshama* or breath of divine life. Thus constituted, he appeared on the theatre of being as the mysterious point of union between matter and spirit, designed, we may humbly believe, to pass through sublimating changes, and, sustained by the ever reparative energies of the Tree of Life, to assume his place in that kingdom which one of Scripture's deepest revelations reminds us had been "prepared for him from the foundation of the world." Man would thus have never come under the alien conditions of death, if he had remained in his obedience. He was not created to die, but to be changed; and of this we may obtain mysterious glimpses, as Müller in his great work on Sin has not failed to point out, in the narrative of the Transfiguration, in which the Second Adam appears elevated above the mortal condition, not by virtue of His divine nature, but by the latent prerogatives of His sinless humanity. And if it be urged that such a conception is irreconcileable with man's terrene constitution, and that his very frame and fabric shows that he could never have been exempt from the general law of dissolution, it has been ever answered—*First*, that, assuming death to have been in the world before man was created, man was and is an *individual*, a living soul, widely different in this respect from any mere member of a genus; *Secondly*, as Bishop Bull and others justly

point out, we can assign no meaning whatever to the Tree of Life, unless we see in it at least this hint, that there was a reparative power ever present and available, and a fountain of what Bull has called a natural immortality.

So far, we have solid Scriptural ground to rest upon. In the circumstances of the Fall, and the subsequent relations of man to that spirit-world through whose malignant agency he fell, and with whom he is in conflict to this hour, we have, as it were, only stepping-stones, yet of a nature and in a connection to warrant us going yet further, and entertaining the profound yet eminently practical question, Was the temptation only something specially designed to test man's obedience, or was it due to the simple, though, of course, permitted hostility of the fallen but not yet finally subdued hierarchy? Can we answer the question? Perhaps only on the assumption, which has been made by speculators of every age, that the Spirit of Evil, while yet the blameless Lucifer, stood in some close, and, it may be, beneficent relations to this earth on which we dwell, and that, in his lapsed state, he was and has been permitted still to retain some of the powers of his old suzerainty. On such an assumption we seem at once to recognise the naturalness of the frightful malignity that sought to lure an innocent race into that fearful knowledge of good and evil which we now possess, and that used every energy, as then so now, to sweep the new occupants of the ancient realm into ruin and destruction. Temptation, thus considered, seems to assume a clear yet deep meaning, and the old declaration of the Apocryphal writer that the moving force of the Spirit of Evil was *envy* (Wisd. ii. 24), a very full significance.

We have said that this is an assumption, and in a certain sense it is so; but, in another sense, it might be considered a legitimate deduction from numerous passages of Scripture which at once come into the mind. Unless there was and remains some such connection, how can we account for the expressions in the mystic scene in the early verses of the Book of Job? How can we explain those many passages in which our Lord speaks of the princedom and power of him whose works He came to destroy? How otherwise can we conceive it possible that St. Paul could have ever designated the Evil One actually as the God of this world (2 Cor. iv. 4)? How, lastly, can we at

all explain or adequately realise the mysterious circumstances of the Lord's temptation, unless we rest on some such hypothesis as this which we are now considering? What otherwise can be the meaning in the mouth of the tempter of those most marvellous words which St. Luke more especially records, "The whole of this power and the glory of them will I give to Thee, *for it hath been given over to me*, and to whomsoever I will I give it"? Are we to say, with Irenæus, that this is only a lie naturally coming from one who was a liar from the beginning, or is it, like the declarations at the temptation in Eden, a frightful half-truth? Surely the latter; surely it seems unnatural to think that a mere unqualified lie could have formed a part of a temptation addressed to the Son of God. If the essential idea of the temptation seems to be the proffer of a *corona sine cruce*, can we doubt that here the old and haughty suzerain is offering to his liege lord a part and portion of that which had been originally given to himself, and a power from which he had not yet been deposed? All this, with its boundless influence on the race the Lord came to save, is offered if only the knee be bent and his own supremacy be acknowledged and confirmed. Is there not in all this a very mysterious confirmation of the view taken of the relation of Satan to this world, both formerly and now?

We might easily carry out these thoughts much further, and show what varied confirmations they receive from the many passages in St. Paul's Epistles, in which the nearness of the powers of evil, their very haunt and locality, and our own lifelong hand-to-hand encounter with them (*πάλη*) is studiously and expressly specified. We might also show how they throw a light on many difficult questions both in the doctrines of salvation and of the last things; how, for example, the very knowledge of right and wrong, so sadly and so fearfully acquired, is nevertheless, by the mighty operation of the manifold wisdom of God, that especially by which redeemed and elect man takes his place hereafter above the very angels, ay, more mysteriously still, sits in judgment upon those very spirits by whose stratagem and temptation he was lured from his first estate. All these, and similar underlying principles, might be set forth with, at any rate, some plausibility, and with apparently the most abundant confirmation from deeper Scripture teaching. But enough, perhaps, has

already been said at least to show the important place Scriptural speculation seems to hold, in these days of free thought, in the illustration and even defence of Gospel truth.

One objection to all that has preceded we can hardly resist very briefly noticing. It will be said, perhaps, and with some show of reason, What real, practical, and moral good will all such speculations do us in days like the present? Even if it be for the moment conceded that they may not wholly be composed of that stuff which dreams are made of, yet is it likely that they could produce any moral effect on honest minds of sceptical bias, or predispose them to greater reverence in forming their estimate of Scriptural Authority? What are we to say in answer? Why perhaps this,—that such speculations have two good practical tendencies; first, they tend to remind the free-handler that there may be deeper and more connected mysteries in Scripture than he has at all taken cognisance of; secondly, they certainly tend to give far nobler views of human life and its responsibilities than are commonly taken, even by moralists of a higher stamp.

In regard of their first tendency, is it not perfectly clear that if there were to be the merest outline of truth even in the hasty sketches of speculative thought that we have put before the reader, no fair thinker could refuse to do otherwise than reconsider many of his objections to revelation? The question would remain,—Does not such deeper investigation tend to confirm the fundamental articles of the Nicene faith? It tends, at any rate, to show their connection and interdependence, and puts, to take the lowest view, their reasonableness in a more favourable light. More, it beneficially provokes comparison. Such an estimate as that which we have taken of man's place in the theatre of being is a far higher one than any modern system of thought has hitherto assigned to him; the conception of God is more comprehensive; the idea of the Mediator more cosmically complete. The reason given of the hope that is in us is quickening and elevating. The truths are only the old truths slightly re-stated, placed in their logical connection, and, where of a nature to admit it, experimentally verified; but, thus re-stated and thus presented to the mind, they claim and they secure that assent and reception which many a candid and philosophic thinker has desired to give, and now does willingly give, when

he perceives and feels the soul-satisfying nature of the answers they supply to ultimate questions. Thus set forth, even when they fail fully to satisfy, they rarely, if ever, fail, in any reasonable mind, to suggest a pause and a reconsideration of the subjects to which they refer. This pause and arrest of judgment is often found to be the one thing needed. Second thoughts can be given and often are given; and these second thoughts, under the directive influence of the Holy Ghost, are afterwards thankfully discerned to be those that at last brought conviction and peace.

But if truths when presented under the speculative aspects we have been lately contemplating are often found thus to exercise a beneficial influence over minds in reference to doubts and difficulties, still more will they be found of the most vital importance in reference to life and practice. Suppose that our speculative view of the deeper meaning and connection of the old truths that we have just been considering is just and reasonable, what ennobling views it presents of life and its mysteries; what a destiny it reveals; what a veritable high calling in Christ Jesus it points to; what mighty conceptions of the manifoldness of the over-ruling wisdom and providence of God it discloses to the Christian thinker. What an answer it gives to a question already alluded to,—a question which may truly be defined as life's deepest question to each one of us,—Why were you born? "Why was I born?" the Christian thinker now may say; "why, to be an actor in a mighty drama, and through Christ to be a fellow-worker, as an Apostle has reminded me, with a restoring Creator. If it be true that there was a lapse in a race higher than my own, and that man was created to succeed to that which was forfeited, then, O the greatness of my loss when sin entered by disobedience, and when the first of my race transmitted to me the dread heritage of a naturally averted will. Yet, O the greater greatness of my gain, when I realised a Saviour, and knew that such were the depths of the divine love, that all that was lost in my forefather Adam, and, it may be more, may be vouchsafed to me in Christ; yes, that my very knowledge of good and evil may be that which will serve to enhance the final moral victory, and that I, weak, frail, and fallen, but saved by my Redeemer's Blood, may be a very instrument in my Creator's hand in that mighty working wherein with the weak and despised things of this earth He will confound and judge the

strong, and finally consummate the victories of His eternal reign. Such, then, is my high calling; not to live for myself, but for God; not selfishly to merge every thought in the salvation of my soul, but rather, for Christ's dear sake, and for my Creator's glory, to strive to keep my baptismal vow, and to do, through the power of the Holy Ghost, that which faithfully done will involve in itself the salvation of my soul, and will place me for ever and for ever, through His love and mercy, in His kingdom and in the reserved and yet waiting seat. And that is why I was born." Such an answer as this is surely a very noble answer. Surely any conceptions that enable us to make such an answer on conviction, and with full persuasion of its truth, cannot be otherwise than among the most edifying and most morally useful that the meditative spirit can entertain.

And now we may close our somewhat lengthened Essay. We have been naturally led over a wide expanse of Christian thought, but we may suitably return whence we started, by the reiteration of the opinion,—now, we will hope, substantiated,—that we are arrived at a more momentous epoch in modern thought than any that has preceded, that now much may be done towards the restoration of belief, but that if this season pass no similar opportunity may ever return. On the one hand, as we have seen, there is a steady drift towards a subtle and pervasive Socinianism, —a Socinianism willing to acknowledge our dear Lord as our only and greatest exemplar, and yet inferentially denying the merits of His sacrifice,—a Socinianism willing even to admit His resurrection, but prepared to deny His divinity, or to accept it only under reservations that either involve contradictions in terms, or, at any rate, are inconsistent with a true faith in the declarations of Scripture and the fundamental articles of the Nicene Faith. On the other hand, we have seen in the awakened feeling for religion, and in the gradual evanescence of the more immoral forms of doubt that presented themselves at the commencement of the period, a clear gravitation towards old truths *if set forth intelligently,* and placed in their proper relations and connections. These are the two considerations which seem clearly brought home to us. God grant that each earnest man among us may act in regard of them according to the measure of the grace given him, and act at once, for the crisis is great, and the time is short.

We now commend these thoughts to the Christian reader. They bear, we know only too well, the traces of interruptions almost numberless, and of constant recommencements that may, to some extent, have marred the continuity and force of the arguments. But it could not be otherwise. The duties, from which the hours have been abstracted wherein to write this Essay, are such as give none of those serene spaces of unbroken time which, we well know, are necessary for the proper treatment of such a subject as that on which we have undertaken to write. Still, we have the lingering hope that we may have supplied aid to some anxious thinkers at a very critical time, and have presented, at any rate, some elevating views of life and its duties to the young and the sensitive. If it be so, our efforts, hindered and interrupted as they have been, may yet receive the blessing of not having been made utterly in vain.

C. J. Gloucester and Bristol.

Nov. 22, 1869.

ESSAY II.

THE STATE, THE CHURCH, AND THE SYNODS OF THE FUTURE.

By WILLIAM J. IRONS, D.D., Oxon.,

Prebendary of St. Paul's, and Rector of Wadingham.

CONTENTS OF ESSAY II.

1. Unsatisfactory relations of the World and the Church till now.
2. The identity of the Revelation, through all secular changes.
3. A new era of change is before us; for the World and the Church.
4. Our own more immediate danger, as to the Faith itself.
5. The position is so new as to oblige recurrence to first principles.
6. The unity of the Church a first principle: under the old covenant,
7. Preserved in Israel's National life, notwithstanding all divisions,
8. And even after the fall of Jerusalem; assisted by their voluntary organization:
9. Surviving, however, through the National life only.
10. The unity of the Church vital also under the new covenant.
11. How this is now to be preserved.
12. Two opposite dangers: Sacerdotalism and Erastianism.
13. The nature of the difficulty stated, and the way to the solution.
14. The idea and the τέλος of secular polity to be seen:
15. And of the spiritual polity—(each being, as a society, a whole).
16. Their contact a necessity of the present dispensation.
17. Condition of the world previous to such contact.
18. The condition of the Church, *in se*, during the contact.
19. The worldly interests of the Church, from the World's point of view.
20. Distinction of the duty of each conscience in worldly things.
21. The moral interests of the world, from its own point of view.
22. A philosophy of the present will only result from induction of secular facts.
23. The Church's self-government is distinct from these.
24. Its care twofold; for the Faith, and for the faithful.
25. How the Apostolic age held the Faith, and guided the faithful.
26. The post-Apostolic age inherited the same responsibility.
27. The Spirit's guidance was not withdrawn.
28. Different kinds of Synods in the first centuries: none then General.
29. Afterwards the first General Synod.
30. Some change of spiritual position in this Synod;
31. Yet not to be hastily blamed; perhaps inevitable and providential.
32. The change touched not the spiritualty, in its essence.
33. The six General Councils under the Imperial laws.
34. Provincial Synods, under the same:
35. And Diocesan Synods; being practical, not dogmatic.
36. National Synods, with laity present; our own, from the first:
37. And after the Norman Conquest, till now.
38. The collections of Canons in the Universal Church.
39. The overthrow of their mixed authority.
40. Prospect as to future Synodical decisions.
41. Their vast extent: a supposed difficulty of hierarchical subdivision.
42. Synodical decisions of discipline always limited.
43. Parenthesis: as to National Conversions; and Laws.
44. Guidance for Provincial Synods in the principles of the first Councils;
45. And not in the habits of semi-secular Convocations.
46. Conventions of the clergy and laity inevitable, and right.
47. Their business, as to temporal things.
48. And spiritual—in what sense?

THE STATE, THE CHURCH, AND THE SYNODS OF THE FUTURE.

1. Nothing is more easy, nothing perhaps more dangerous to us now, than misapprehension and misstatement of the relations of the World and the Church. Some brief and close examination of this great subject will scarcely be thought unseasonable at a time like the present, when our atmosphere is surely charged with elements of change both ecclesiastical and political.

During the first three hundred years of Christianity, the new Religion and the Roman Empire had but few satisfactory relations of any kind. It was the instinct of the one to advance, and of the other to check the advancement; and there was a state of hostility on both sides. From the beginning of the fourth century till now, the Religion and civil society have formally recognised each other, though in various ways. Total estrangement had become on all accounts impossible; and yet the duties of the Government and the rights of the individual conscience were but imperfectly ascertained. Imperialism in the State, and a Patriarchate-government in the Church, attempted for a time, though on no clear principle, to work together; until at length the Empire broke up gradually into nations. Nationalism next secured, with unequal fortune in different lands, some concordat of the temporal and spiritual powers. The Episcopate, though everywhere alike maintaining its sacred rank, seemed to know no consistent theory of civil submission, but simply accepted the *de facto* position, unless obliged to resist special wrong; and at length the Papacy put forth its long latent claims, widely vacillating between hopes of spiritual supremacy and an assertion of universal lordship.

2. Through all these changes of eighteen centuries now past, the Revelation of God in Christ, consigned to His Church, has

preserved its sameness. The one Baptism, the Eucharist, the Creeds, the Episcopate secured this; but not without the concurrence of a vast system of living tradition, more or less expressed in canons and laws. Nor does the Canonical discipline, with its multiform rules, owe its origin to the later times: it dates back to the beginning. The "Code of the Universal Church" was no afterthought, like the old Decretals, no invention of popes, or emperors, or kings, or people. Its first document is the eighty-five "Canons Apostolical;" and four centuries passed away before these or any other laws of the Church were formally incorporated with any of the laws of this world. The object of the canons of Councils was always two-fold;—to preserve unchanged the "faith once delivered," and to knit in one body the scattered members of the whole Christian society. And no doubt the unity of the Church, as including both the unity of the faith and the unity of the faithful, has hitherto been thus defended, though not thus alone, in all times and places, with different measures of success.

3. A new era seems to be now commencing both for the World and the Church; and all Europe at least appears conscious of it, from north to south. Even the heads of the Roman Catholic Church and nations recognise some grave changes as approaching,—the unfriendly attitude of the civil power, and the existing bases of thought and education, being everywhere such as cannot be permanent. The approaching Council of the Roman Episcopate is perhaps a necessity for them far more than a choice. Among ourselves, too, coming events it is said "cast their shadows before;" and our present concern is chiefly with ourselves. If the fall of the Irish Establishment presages no disaster for England, yet it cannot be without its influence on us. Suddenly the prelates and clergy of the sister isle have been called to act for themselves in religion, apart from the State; almost as completely as Christians were obliged to act before the establishment by Constantine. We are deeply concerned in the careful maintenance of truth, in a position which our enemies would gladly make our own.

4. It is a position so new, and humanly speaking so embarrassing, on both sides,—that of a Church suddenly deprived of its accustomed substitute for discipline,—that primitive and vital principles concerning the Faith itself, may at any moment

be in danger. Synods have long ceased to be vital parts of our discipline. Conferences and convocations and congresses have acted under what we may deem such providential restraints that comparatively little practical evil has come, through them, even of much ill-informed speaking. But an Irish free synod that must act at once on its own resolutions or canons will be a far different matter: and wrong heads, or designing ones (in the present condition of dogmatic theology) might, ere the Church was aware, adopt methods which might place the Irish in collision with the English, and indeed with the Universal Church; and also furnish perilous precedents for the less Catholic among ourselves as to matters both of faith and practice.

5. And indeed the preservation of Unity when any Church is separated from the Patriarchate system, and from the Papacy, and from the State, must needs be a solemn difficulty, and yet any local Church may soon have to face it. It is in truth a position in which mere precedents cannot be expected to be wholly applicable, and Churchmen must fall back on first principles, if they would be safe. For unity of the faith, and unity of the faithful, are no fanciful perfections, which may be had or not, without consequence. To lose the former, at least, is to lose that "good and acceptable and perfect will of God" made known to us in Christ.

6. To restore to man the everlasting truth which the countless falsehoods of polytheism and immorality had distorted is one great object which has been divinely aimed at in the whole course of Revelation, from the day when the promise first assured "the friend of God" as to the "One Seed" in whom all men should yet be blessed. "Hear, O Israel, the Lord thy God is One Lord" was the divine prelude to the true Religion; and no unfaithfulness to this was permitted, but every movement hostile to it was henceforth visited with anger. It was a first principle, and its contradiction, therefore, inadmissible.

The unity of the Church, under the old covenant, founded on this, was throughout essentially secured by the organization and discipline, implied in that one promise of blessing. It was a unity constituted in the Hebrew family as such, and ever defined by the limits of the tribes of Israel. No internal dissensions would ever be allowed to efface that

unity; it was in the very blood of the people. Even their priesthood followed "the law of this carnal commandment" from Aaron; and their monarchy equally inherited "the sure mercies of David,"—"of the fruit of thy body will I set upon thy seat." In all the struggles and sins, all the captivities and dispersions and divisions, this nationality proved to be indestructible. Individuals and even sections of the race might seem to be absorbed in other civilisations; but the people still lived, and bore on its front everywhere the mark and the purpose of its identity.

7. How priceless a value was set on this oneness of the people, who were witnesses of the one "God of all the earth," may be read in their history throughout. And yet it often seemed as if it only lived because it could not die. The natural law of blood, protected surely by some unseen care, came in aid of the accompanying law of divine revelation; and the monotheistic truth, and the Messianic hope, committed to this nation were therefore never lost. It is not, as we have intimated, that there were no schisms and heresies among them; not that opinions had been uniform as to their law or their prophets; not that the outward framework of their polity or their worship had been pure even for a single generation. Ephraim "vexed Judah, and Judah Ephraim:" Pharisees denounced Sadducees, and Essenes withdrew from both, and Samaritans "had no dealings" with the Jews at all. They would eagerly have destroyed one another; and again and again, the world's rulers, from the plot of Haman to that of Sejanus in Tiberius's time, or to the decrees of Imperial Rome in her yet severer days, would willingly have exterminated them all, and "taken away both their place and nation:" but it could not be. The "bush might burn with fire," but could not be consumed.

8. Even when their temple was finally cast down, and every child of Israel seemed proscribed by his fellow man, there existed the same undying unity. True, they had no longer a centre of worship to which they could look; save only the holy land itself, towards which, though they were forbidden to tread it, their hearts all moved, and—"if I forget thee, O Jerusalem"—came fearfully to mind. And then they wrote down in their Talmud the traditions of their Rabbins, which, before that, had lived but orally for ages. Then they organized their fallen

schools, and arranged fresh internal discipline for synagogues in all the Roman world, and beyond the Roman limits. But even this was not enough: for they had a sterner task before them: they had to protect the threatened unity of their people and religion against the dangers of a greater dispersion than ever; and so they ventured to construct, what may almost appear to have been typical, one wide moral government, not only with no external help, but even amidst the undissembled hatred and not unfrequent persecutions of all governments and peoples.

9. Then too between the principal divisions of the nation, the Jews under the Prince of the Captivity in the East, and those subjected to their Patriarch of the West (both as if unconsciously working to attain and preserve their unity), how long and frequent were the strifes!

Yet a voluntary government without Divine right was what the Jewish people really aimed at, for their dispersed settlements in all lands. If to some extent, indeed, it succeeded, if the *imperium in imperio* of the synagogue proved, with the advance of civilisation and toleration, to be not impossible, it was not by the force of the voluntary combination, but because their religious unity still had the natural tie which blood alone provides. Truth had been then committed by God to a nation, not yet to a society; and the nation alone thus contained the unity and the life of the religion.

10. Is there no lesson in all that story of three thousand years' unity of the Old Covenant, for us who have had committed to us, under such different conditions—as a great society among all nations—the grace and truth of the New Covenant? For still the principle remains, that the sacred deposit is one; and the unity of the faithful is also His law who has said, "there is one Body and one Spirit, even as ye are called with one Hope of your calling; one Lord, one Faith, one Baptism, one God." The Unity can now no more be national; for it proclaims, "He hath made of one blood all nations." The Unity would, in the future, have also to embrace far wider limits than the Jewish dispersion could know; and yet it must consist with "My kingdom is not of this world." The government of that "kingdom" must be voluntary, and yet of Divine right; but, then, on that account, its constitution could be no creation of its own canons,

and no mere foundation of human schools; since it claimed from the first to be the "habitation of God through the Spirit."

11. Let us consider. The idea of the Church from this sacred point of view, being that of a moral society, aiming to spread itself in all nations, and (without interfering with the secular government) to extend a voluntary government of its own for the unity of its creed and its members, the question arises,—How is that possible?—Such is the question to be now solved, both by the Church and the World.

It cannot be right to think a compromise to be the only resort. For every such compromise seems to imply some sacrifice of integrity for the secular government of a nation, and of purity in the conduct of the Church. And then there always follows the inevitable struggle on both sides to remedy the felt incongruity, the struggle tending on the Church's part to what is deemed "Sacerdotalism," and on the part of the State to what is termed "Erastianism:" the Sacerdotalism aiming at a quasi-spiritual ideal, patriarchal or papal; the Erastianism seeking a consistent supremacy in its own sphere.

12. The danger latent in misdeveloping Sacerdotalism is that it must, if unchecked, supersede not only all existing secular governments, but every kind of administration of this world on its own natural principles; it aims at that which is not simply an insufferable tyranny, necessarily menacing moral agency itself everywhere, but an impossibility, a contradiction in the nature of things; because the perfection of any order of being must imply an administration of its own constituents according to its own nature: and man's nature is a moral nature, and must be morally dealt with. The danger, on the other hand, of an Erastian theory of government is not less serious both to liberty and to ethics. It tends undeviatingly to the result proclaimed by an old oracle of heathenism, the Delphic sentence that "the religion of each man's own city is the best." It denies that unity of faith which revelation has to proclaim. It tends to the destruction of the action of conscience in every man, or to a tyranny at least as inexcusable as that of Sacerdotalism. The dilemma is a grave one between the two parties. It seems a choice of separating morality—which, in some outward respects, must be indispensable to the State—from religion, which touches the springs of all morality; or else of absorbing all

morality and law in religion: the former involving a moral, the latter a philosophical contradiction.

13. It were well for all, and might lead to forbearance and carefulness in treating the whole subject, if this contradiction were seen and felt.

It might also teach the men of action on both sides the unworthiness of trusting a sort of "last my time" principle. For every good man must think that the world is not to be treated as a moral enigma, but that policy and ethics must have a reasonable sphere, if only we will take pains and time to ascertain it. It is really impossible to think, that for a being who must exist in and for society—as man must—there are no laws of inter-association and mutual government to be found, which shall be consistent with his moral nature. For this is the real point to be considered. And before we can advance to the examination of what ought to be the action of that voluntary self-government which, as we have implied, the theory of the Church regards as her right, we must somewhat further clear our minds as to the essential nature and necessary claims of these two polities—the natural and the spiritual. The jealousy on either side, and the practical dread of *imperium in imperio*, can only be removed or even alleviated, by a recurrence to the idea of each community, and also to the τέλος in each case.

14. The least superiority above the state of savages places men in the midst of a polity, a complicated system of mutual understandings and laws, for the defence of mutual well-being. As any polity advances towards perfection, it tends to ascertain the best standard of right for all the community, and aims to administer justice to all according to that standard. Nor can the well-being so aimed at be merely material; because material well-being involves considerations of the equitable, the true, and the pure—in a word, the *moral*. But then it is the practical moral that such polity has to administer, not a theory of morals; it has to do with the present direction of the *meum* and *tuum*—the cognisance of mutual affirmation or negation in reference to facts between man and man, and the *de facto* protection, it may be, of the refinements and instincts of humanity. We have in this both the idea and the τέλος of a polity of this world. Such polity is not only a necessity for us, but, if perfected, would be conceived to have in itself a sufficiency for its end. We should

greatly err if we conceived that in polity, as thus stated, there is an antagonism to anything good or true in the universe. Human society as such here on earth is not an abnormal fact, an aberration, a mistake *per se:* it had an intention of its own from the first. For its moral as well as material life there must be a fit and right and even sacred development. And if it be replied that human society is now not in a natural but in a fallen and mutilated state, still, we answer, it is in such a state that moral probation goes on and should be externally governed well.

15. The Spiritual polity, on the other hand, professes to be a "new Creation," begun by the Holy Ghost 1800 years ago, and increasing from age to age by means of Divine gifts, and by change of human character through the conscience of the individual, and all with a view to a future life. It professes to have, of itself, no material or secular claims or powers. So far as the members of the Spiritual polity have any rights, or powers, or property on earth, they have them (like other men) as citizens of earth. Inasmuch as they have also a polity that is heavenly, they are *quoad hoc* beyond the touch of this world. But since the "old Creation" really now exists under laws and with a life peculiarly its own, the "new-Creation" has to deal with this fact, while affirming its own distinctness, its own laws, and life, and aim. Each society then—the World and the Church—is to be conceived as an organic whole. It has, therefore, as every being must have, its own unity, its own identity, by virtue of which it is what it is, and is not another. As an organic whole it may grow, but cannot be mechanically added to. The Church and the World, it seems then at once from this, cannot be artificially united.

16. It might be thought at first glance that two such societies could never clash,—the State having externally to govern good citizens morally made so by the Church,—but this is an idea which quickly vanishes. Things are not yet so perfect. The two are "growing together," each incomplete for a time, and they cannot help being now in undefined contact. The "new world," or new society, is constituted out of materials furnished and partly shaped by the old. The later creation aims at transforming certain constituents of the earlier, and expects what is not so transformed ultimately "to pass away." The Church knows that itself is a permanent reality, and, on the contrary,

that the world's exhausted elements will at last "melt with fervent heat," and "depart with great noise," when "He that sitteth on the throne" shall announce the completion, "behold I make all things new." Meanwhile, and for a prolonged season, there are moral and spiritual truths pertaining to both worlds; each has to deal with the conscience and actions of men; the old world being concerned directly with the external and practical, the Church primarily appealing to the inner life and moral power. The World has to do with humanity as to its external manifestations: the Church goes deeper, into the nature and vital spring of the man himself. The World has no faculty for going beneath the surface; the Church has. But the World having its real sphere of outward duty, is there bound to regulate the mutual terms of society in the interest of all its members. Its power of external government is no usurpation. It is essential to humanity as existing here and now. Its power is as much a sacred gift of heaven as is its natural life and being. "There is no power but of GOD, and the powers that be are ordained of God" even now.

17. We must look at this yet more closely. There was a time when the new Creation had not begun; it was wholly future: it existed only as a purpose in the Divine mind, an eternal idea "in Christ before the world began." The old Creation was first begun, and it led the way to the future. The spiritual did not precede in point of time; "first that which is natural and afterwards that which is spiritual." And if we had contemplated human society, with its limited capacity of self-regulation before the actual beginning of the new Creation, (*i.e.* the spiritual and permanent humanity), we should have seen each individual conscience standing apart with its own inner responsibility, while the secular government of every society of such consciences was without any inner access to any of them. It could only deal with the phenomena of outward action. Nothing could illustrate more completely the imperfect and transitionary state of the old world, or the natural incapacity of all merely human government for purely religious, or for even the higher moral functions. It does not, it cannot, approach the sanctuary of any man's conscience. Its power "is of God" doubtless—an "economy" for the present æon; but its sphere is practical, in the most literal sense, and for this present æon only.

18. Then, on the other hand, the new Creation is, by the very law of its being, precluded from all interference with that coercive jurisdiction which exclusively belongs to the old. It absolutely cannot touch the members of the "old Creation" except through each conscience, and by the Sacraments of the new life. If it attempts to do so directly by "alliance with the state," or indirectly by "handing over to the civil power," it is not acting in its own sphere, nor on its own principles: it is, for the time being, adapting its course to passing circumstances—its own divine theory and divine life, whatever the Syllabus may say, have nothing to do with any such transitory development. The Church's own jurisdiction is solely *in foro interno;* and if it even have, or seem to have, any power in any outward or visible court, whether so-called ecclesiastical or not (except a moral spiritual and sacramental power) it is only by the permission, tolerance, or connivance of the secular power, to whom alone all outward and coercive government rightfully pertains in this world. Even the Church's needful claim to meet in congress, or association, can only be dealt with by the world as it would deal with a like claim on the part of any other union or corporation in the community.

19. Nor is it less obvious, that the material and present interests of Christians, as citizens of this world, are equally subject to the civil power, and in the same absolute sense, as their persons. The State could not rationally act on any other view. The Church, as such, received not on the day of Pentecost any power to possess, hold or transmit any property independently of earthly jurisdiction: and so, if ever the Church accept an acre of this world's land, it only accepts it under and entirely subject to this world's laws. The State would abdicate its function, if it forgot this. It is for the State to consider from time to time whether the Church, like any other special society, may advantageously be allowed to hold and transmit, under the protection of worldly laws, a portion of the property of this world. Experience seems to have taught, that civilisation effectually hands on certain of its advantages by facilitating for the next generation the enjoyment of the benefits of the past. Endowments may be the transference of civilisation, and, held thus by this world's laws, they are under the responsible control of the State. Gifts offered to "the service of God and the

Church," at any time, are individual gifts; no individual can give that which he has not; and no individual has the future in his power. If he be permitted by the State to destine his present property for future uses, and the State protects him in it, it is because, from experience, the State finds it good; and the State, from its own point of view, is not to preserve such disposition of property any longer than it thinks it right and good for the community at large; which alone the State has to consider.

20. The Church, we say, has to do with individuals first.—Barnabas had a property in Cyprus; he sold it and placed the proceeds at the Apostles' disposal, and they could use it at once, in any not illegal way. He did not transfer the land to the Church, because he could not do it without the permission of the State, by whose laws and law-officers the disposition of all land would have to be defended.—Certain kings and great men in past ages gave tithes to the Church, of their broad estates: it is to be supposed that they thought it their individual duty so to give tithes. They were in those times able to secure also that such tithes and land should be given after their death to the same objects; because the State thought it good to allow them to do so. It is common enough now to say that certain property so given is "given to God," and cannot be "alienated" to other uses: which is true, during the life-time of the giver, to a certain extent. It is true, in the same sense as of all other rightful property of individuals, which, of course, should not be invaded by others, *i.e.* (as a general rule and to that extent), it is "inalienable." But the limits of disposal of property by will, or by endowment, at a man's death, cannot but be regulated by the laws of this world, and by the rulers of human society. Indeed, to suppose, on the other hand, in reference to this habitable world, that a "tenth part of it belongs to God," as some have expressed it, and might be "willed" or bequeathed to God, is less than the truth, and is even shocking if it means to question that "the whole earth is the Lord's and the fulness thereof" without any one's will. It is far beyond what is true, if it means, that tithe is a compulsory due, Divinely held under human law. It may be simple truth ill expressed, if it only teaches that each individual member of the Church may personally pay tithe (as of conscience) of "all that he hath," according to the type of Abraham, "the father of the faithful,'

who gave tithe to Melchisedec, "the priest of the most High God."

21. And now it may be hoped that this brief exposition of the first principles of the two Societies, the Church and the World, may lead us to mark, with less difficulty, the duties which in our time will surely lie before us, in adjusting the relations of the Church and the people and governments of the World.

If we were here called to define for Statesmen the moral duties of their own practical sphere, we should have to attempt in detail the analysis of many questions of a mixed kind, which, after all, can only be determined by a growing experience. For statesmen will not in future become *doctrinaires*, or philosophers on society. Their sphere, it is now seen, is outside the conscience, and outside the purely speculative intellect too. Whether the management of mixed moral questions by means of Religious agencies be a necessity for a time, it were unpractical to discuss: since *de facto* it will certainly be so, and ought to be, until, if ever, the State is ready to act alone as a whole. But that we should conceive of a Government of human society able to separate its own practical ethics from the higher ethics of the inner life, without denying or injuring the higher, it is impossible to question, if we believe human society, in its natural state, to be an "ordinance of God," and its ministers "ministers of God for good." The world has exterior moral interests of its own, to be contemplated from its own point of view, and with reference to its own ἰδέα and its own τέλος.

No doubt there is a real danger for civil society, as well as anxiety for the Church (*see Sect.* 4), in that transition period which may follow the separation of the two powers. The danger is that the public morality may be separated from the religious consciousness of the people, and the result might then be a fall to a ruinous kind of heathenism. It is not enough for the ethical order of a community that the accepted moral system has symmetry and truth: it needs life and power. That life and power is not now given, or even conceivable as given, except to the individual conscience. The public morality is a result of the action of the individual consciences of the community. It will always be so. If individuals have no religious spring of moral action, the Government cannot long affect to have it. The morality of the ancient world was

ruined because "*men* did not like to retain God in their knowledge," (not because *Governments* did not like it). The public morality of the present age is maintained by Governments making use of the religious organizations around them—not always indeed without degrading them. The public morality of the future must give the largest and wisest freedom to moral agency, (including the Church's individual conscientiousness, and her corporate action). It is the interest of the world to leave the Church free to raise the moral standard. A Government can only become what has been termed "Godless," by hindering the conscience of its subjects.*

22. To examine, on grounds of political reason, the future of Europe would no doubt be an occupation very suitable to the Christian thinker, and profitable, it may be, for the responsible guides of the State. To the Christian, because he would feel how great a deliverance for religion it would be, if secular government should not overstep, but well understand, its own large moral limits: to the Statesman, because his work would thus be indeed elevated to a dignity undreamt of in the mere strife of political party. If the State were doing its own duty on the truest principles of its existence, a Churchman (as must be repeated) should desire of the State no other advantage than pertains to him as a citizen; nor claim for his property—land, fabrics, trusts, or personal possessions—any more protection than would be given to any other individual, or any corporation in the community. He may find it hard, perhaps, to realise this at first. As the citizen at once of two worlds, the natural and the spiritual, the Christian must learn to render two-fold allegiance, as Christ directed, "unto Cæsar in the things of Cæsar, and unto God in the things of God." Though the Church is, to heavenly eyes, "the habitation of God through the Spirit:" yet to the world it is, and can be, only a corporation, to be treated like every other corporation, justly and wisely: and as to all those border questions which lie between the two worlds and touch the natural as well as the spiritual man,—questions of social subordination, the structure of the family, the education of the young, the civilisation of the adult-ignorant,

---

* This has been referred to in the writer's 'Analysis of Human Responsibility,' p. 29, in connexion with a view in Mr. Gladstone's 'Autobiography.'

the reformation of the criminal, and so on—their exoteric adjustment, if we may so speak, is surely more hopeful now than ever before. Man's outer life here is a fact; and a true induction of its details will yet be the basis of some philosophy of the present.

23. Our way, then, being greatly cleared, we turn from general considerations, to the practical work before the Church in her own special sphere. The Church, while claiming what even any natural society might claim, viz., the internal government of her own members, does not vacate her higher claim to be also a Divine institution with a hidden life. We have admitted that the claim, in that form, will be unrecognised by those who are external to the special or sacred society. The World, as a body, could not admit it, without ceasing to be the world, and vacating its position; and we could not ask or conceive it. If every member of the World were to become individually a member of the Church, the organization of natural society and its government and duties would remain exactly as before. The self-government of the Church is spiritual, voluntary, and heaven-guided: but its objects are "not of this world." Such a society may fairly ask of the world to be unmolested (like any other institute or body, *e.g.* of philanthropy, art, or science), *to be let alone;* unless it intrude beyond its sphere into the world's own department of government and power.

24. The two-fold object of the Church Militant (let us here recall it) is the unity of the faith and the sanctification of the faithful. Guided by the Spirit who is ever inhabiting her, no doubt the Church has from the beginning acted, so far as her earthly conditions have allowed, as a whole. But there was no theoretical instruction, known at least to us, that the Church's self-government should develop in all respects according to its first pattern, or exigencies, either in the mode of maintaining the faith once delivered, or in the organization of the faithful. If, however, we watch the facts, we shall see what has been done, and may possibly learn our theory, from Him who all along has been "working all in all."

25. For indeed it seems inconceivable that Christ, having promised "I will build My Church," took no measures to accomplish it effectually. First, then, we know there were those to whom

Christ said, "Go, baptize the nations," and "teach them to observe *all things whatsoever* I have commanded you." He said this to his Apostles, whom He had chosen; He said it, we believe, to no others: and to His Apostles He promised, "Lo, I am with *you* always." It was their business, their duty (never to be surrendered by them), henceforth to hold and teach the faith of Christ. During the Apostles' life-time they held it. When they "finished their course," having "kept the faith," the promise, "lo, I am with you to the end of the world" did not fall to the ground. They committed "the deposit," as they said, to "faithful men." The promise remained; and "feed my sheep" remained: and the Spirit left not the body of the Church. They whom Apostles appointed to come after them, to "feed the flock of God" over which they were made "overseers," were charged still to do it—(ἐπίσκοποι). The sheep, and the shepherds over them, thus were not uncared for in the wilderness; and if we "go our way by the footsteps of the flock," we yet may hope to be in safe pastures of faith unchanged.

So long as Apostles lived, the special *charismata* of the Holy Ghost also commonly appeared in each newly converted city, and the unity of the Faith remained. And, farther, the faithful themselves were kept in union among themselves by being united, as Apostles commanded, to their own pastors and teachers everywhere. We simply state the fact. Visible unity of the faithful would always, in the nature of the case, be but local. But the sacramental or Divine unity, begun by the Apostles themselves, was universal. All the Christian societies were in correspondence indeed through their own officers, bishops, priests, and deacons, both as to creed and discipline; but they were ever essentially and Divinely in union, through the "one Baptism" and "that one Bread," and the Faith in the one "God and Father, and one Lord Jesus Christ."

26. The next age of the Church's history of course produced new necessities, both as to the faith and the faithful; but not unprovided for in the promise, "with you always." Eye-witnesses and ministers of the word, and even their immediate friends, had been withdrawn from the scene. The tares of wrong teaching, "sown by the enemy," had plentifully begun to appear. What course was then taken? and what has since then been the method used by the Church as a self-governing, spiritual

body, in order to continue the unity and purity of the Faith? For, after all, it is of that we must primarily think.

There is no question at all that Christians were everywhere locally arranged, as soon as possible, into divisions of convenient size for common worship; and thus also they were accustomed to meet together, when not prohibited by the secular government, for mutual assistance and consultation as to all matters of common interest to them; and what interest could ever arise comparable to that of their Faith? The least rumour of a false teaching assembled at once, we are told, any local body of believers; then, if necessary, the Christians of the next city, town, or village. Any still greater difficulty brought together as quickly the brethren from yet remoter places. The voices of testimony then raised among them, as to "the old commandment which they had received from the beginning," was decisive of the fact. Such meetings were what came to be termed "Synods" or "Councils;" and as they first naturally arose, so they continued, with singular uniformity and for the same ends, at least from the Synod of Aquileia to the establishment under Constantine (*see Section* 2).

27. Was there any express command of God, we repeat, that His Church should act together in that form? We know but little. We only know that the Spirit was in the Church, and that "He shall guide you into all truth" was the promise; and that this was the thing done; and that, under Providence, even the State gradually permitted it to be done, and that thus the unity of the Faith was kept. It seems natural to ask, Could it be safe to depart from this?

But were these assemblies what we now call Representative Assemblies? that is to say, did Christians in various places select "deputies," who, elected in certain numbers, were to appear in behalf of their "constituents," and decide by majority? Certainly such a supposition is little in accordance with what we gather of the first history, and apparently also has a worldliness opposed to the theory of the Church. The Synods of this period would hardly have intended to exclude any, either clergy or laity, so far was mere "deputation" from being intended; for it would still have been natural for the chief clergy or teachers, in all cases, to have been the only persons who taught the faith at such meetings, either by definition, or letter, or decree, who-

ever might be present. Each chief pastor of a district was even held, we find, to be responsible for taking his part, if possible, in these assemblies. It never seems to have occurred to any one that the people, even if present, ought there to begin to teach, or to pronounce sentence, or take to deciding matters of faith. Rightly or wrongly (as man might say), the fact is so, that to the chief pastors of the Church, and none others, the solemn work of definitive decision in Synod on all matters of faith then pertained. "Feed My sheep;" "teach all nations:" such was the supposed warrant for this. So far as we know, there is no exception.

28. But these assemblies were not all of one kind. There soon came to be defined meetings of bishops, all acting in one Province; and then there followed meetings of several provinces; and there were solemn sessions of Christians in every place in particular under their own individual Bishop.

There are even traces of some early Synods, of a time anterior to now existing documents, in which apostolic rules had been laid down; and the *ἀρχαῖα ἔθη* were proclaimed for the guidance of that age of Christians which is called "post-Apostolic."

Yet during the Ante-Nicene period there was no meeting of the whole Church. It was not possible: it was not, as far as appears, even thought of as possible—a most remarkable fact. The unity of the Church did not imply that, in those 300 years. Letters of bishops passing between the Churches of Europe, Asia, and Africa, and the onward movement of Missions, were the only means apparently known for wide intercommunion; and through these was also circulated the one Catholic Faith.

To question all this would be only shutting our eyes to facts. There was then no movement whatever, except such as described, whether on the part of the bishop of Rome or any other bishop, for the outward unity of the whole Church. The bishop of Alexandria was a most prominent and useful person; but neither did he conceive the magnitude of the growing work. The unexpected establishment of Christianity, in other words, the concurrence of the civil power at the beginning of the 4th century, alone enabled the Church for the first time on a large scale even to proclaim her one Creed. When the necessity arose, the Civil power was the providential cause of the first General Council.

29. This is no fact of light significance. We perceive that

all the Councils, of two or three kinds, which had preceded the 4th century had been but local. There had been no fixed rule announced as to what members of the Church might be present in them. But the unvarying custom had prevailed for bishops alone to be the teachers or guides in those Councils; and presbyters and deacons, at most, only lent their assistance in debate. Those assemblies simply testified their own faith; they brought together such as could be had of the prelates and their friends in contiguous localities on each emergency. To this we must add, however, that it could hardly have been accidental; it was too uniform for that. As surely as the Holy Ghost led the Church, He led it thus. It was then the *only* public fulfilment of "lo, I am with you always;" and "He shall lead you into all truth."

But a mighty evil that had now arisen, even the extended denial of the Godhead of Christ, was a call for a mightier remedy than local protests of the orthodox. No equal crisis had been known since the Pentecost. It was cause enough, it was reason enough, for the great convulsion of the world which then followed. Looking back now, it surely seems as if the mighty angels of swift providences were suddenly sent forth. The Roman emperor did not as yet himself believe in Christ; but Constantine had to make the way for a General Council for a great emergency; converted or not converted (for it is questioned), the ruler of this world must pause, and make the world listen, while voices summoned from all the earth proclaimed the Deity of its Saviour.

30. Thus the position of the Christian Church was at that crisis submitted to a change such as had not passed over it from its first moment of existence. Difficulties which seemed well nigh insuperable were overcome by the imperial orders, and the whole world soon heard and obeyed the summons to Nicæa. But that was not all: the fact now appeared that a vast assembly of the followers of Christ was suddenly for the first time obeying the call of a heathen or half-converted monarch, acquiescing, almost without thought, in his assumed right in some sense to direct them in the discharge of the most imposing function that they had ever been called to perform.

Hitherto, in all the decisions arrived at in their assemblies, Christians had had no means of compelling the obedience of

the members of their brotherhood. They could refuse to hold communion with the refractory; they could exclude from their friendship those who did not submit to the spiritual authority of their teachers; but that was all. Previous to the edict of Milan, the enforcement even of any right was a most precarious attempt for Christians in a matter of religion. But henceforth the decisions of Church meetings would be recognised and carried out by the State. Church synods would be called by Imperial authority, and presided over by the Imperial commissioner or nominee, or even by the Emperor himself.—

31. In a pardonable eagerness, perhaps, to defend the spiritual character and prerogatives of the Church of Christ, many have been ready to blame the civil governors of the Empire, and of nations that arose on the ruins of the Empire, for their "interference" with Synods. But if we will do justice to the case, we shall soon moderate this censure. The State had but three possible courses. It was either to be, as heretofore, hostile to the Church, or in friendly alliance with it, or in independence of it. The third course would not be possible, until political and social science had advanced so far as to define the limits of individual liberty and general law in any community. Not till then would the State know how far an association of individuals for other than State objects could be admitted. If ever our knowledge of government is sufficiently matured to enable the State to leave moral associations like the Church to their own action, the independence of the two polities may be possible. The State has now for 1500 years in Europe been in union with the Church, on various terms; while Providence has yet guided the course of events for us, so that whenever the Church has been faithful, the purely spiritual functions have not been usurped by the Civil Power.—

32. To recur, then, to the case of the first Œcumenical Council. It is true that Constantine was present, though probably as yet a heathen; but as the governor of the Empire he would have forgotten his duty altogether had he not watched the united action of a great association like the Church, spread throughout all the nations, for whose government, as nations, he was supremely responsible. So grave a dereliction of duty as would have been implied in his absence on such an occasion would have been unpardonable. But though present, nothing

could have been more fair than his whole bearing. He did not attempt to decide the great question in debate. He allowed the 318 bishops to decide. They, and none but they,—as the President Hosius reminded the Emperor,—the chief priests of the churches, must pronounce the definition of the Faith. The Emperor accepted the decision of the bishops. He had then no choice but to enforce its acceptance also on those who would desire to hold position in the churches of his Empire.

33. But it is natural to ask, on what principle were those 318 bishops brought together? Were they selected by the Emperor, or by any one, with any special view? On the contrary, we are not aware that any bishops in the communion of the Church in any part of the world were forbidden to come to the Council of Nicæa; and they brought with them, we know, priests and deacons, if they pleased. They did not affect to come as mere representatives of absent prelates. They came for themselves, each to speak for his own church's faith. And they were no strangers to the work of synods; they inherited the traditions of the Apostles, and the precedents of their fathers were familiar to them. They pronounced the "faith once delivered to the saints;" and they set forth the "ancient customs" of the churches in matters of discipline.

Not often has so august an assembly of the chiefs of the Church been permitted to gather together. Even the theologians of Rome reckon no more than eighteen such assemblies in the eighteen centuries. Six of these were held before the division of the Church into East and West had unhappily become normal. The decisions of those six are acknowledged by all the Churches,—the Roman, the Anglican, and the Greek. Those six were all summoned by the civil power; and all presided over as the civil power permitted; all decreed their definitive sentences by the voices of bishops alone; and all were accepted by the civil governor, and their decrees incorporated with the laws of the empire. Those six Œcumenical Synods were all regarded also as speaking under the guidance of the Holy Ghost; and to each of them was applied the title "Sancta," as inheriting the promise of the Holy One (referred to in the latest definitions of the sixth of the synods), "where two or three are gathered together in My name, there am I."

(1.) At Nicæa (A.D. 325), the Great Council of Christianity pronounced against Arius, the blasphemer of the Son.
(2.) At Constantinople (A.D. 381), decision was given against Macedonius, the denier of the Holy Ghost.
(3.) At Ephesus (A.D. 431), against Nestorius, who divided the Person of Christ:
(4.) At Chalcedon (A.D. 451), against Eutyches, who confused His Natures.
(5.) At Constantinople (A.D. 553), (the 2nd time), against revivers of the same errors.
(6.) At Constantinople (A.D. 681), (the 3rd time), against new modes of the old heresies.

The Emperors Constantine, Theodosius I. and II., Marcian, Justinian, and Constantine Pogonatus, in succession ordered these councils.*

34. But it was obvious at once that the continual regulation of the disciples of this new and vast moral dominion—the living Church throughout the world—could not be attained by great

---

* The remaining so-called General Synods are these—(which are not Œcumenical):—

(7.) Nicæa II. (A.D. 787.) Against the Iconoclasts, under the Empress Irene.
(8.) Constantinople IV. (A.D. 869.) Against Photius, under the Emperor Basil.
(9.) Lateran I. (A.D. 1123.) Against the Saracens.
(10.) Lateran II. (A.D. 1139.) Against the Schism.
(11.) Lateran III. (A.D. 1180.) Against the Waldenses.
(12.) Lateran IV. (A.D. 1215.) Against the Saracens.
(13.) Lyons I. (A.D. 1245.) Against Frederick II., &c.
(14.) Lyons II. (A.D. 1274.) Against Greek errors.

Those of Vienne (A.D. 1311), Florence (A.D. 1439), Lateran V. (A.D. 1517), and Trent (A.D. 1545), &c., complete the 18.

The Roman Canonists assign to the Pope the authoritative convocation of all the Councils called Œcumenical; but without any historical justification as to the first Six. Their statement is now as follows. They regard:

1. Nicæa	as meeting under Pope	Sylvester.
2. Constantinople ..		Damasus.
3. Ephesus		Celestine I
4. Chalcedon		Leo I
5. Constantinople II.		Vigilius.
6. Constantinople III.		Agatho.
7. Nicæa II.		Adrian I.
8. Constantinople IV.		Adrian II.
9. Lateran I.		Callistus II.
10. " II.		Innocent II.
11. " III.		Alexander III.
12. " IV.		Innocent III.
13. Lyons I.		Innocent IV
14. " II.		Gregory X.
15. Vienne		Clement V.
16. Florence		Eugenius IV.
17. Lateran V.		Leo X.
18. Trent		Paul III. & Pius IV.
to which is to be added—		
19. Rome, or "Vatican I."		Pius IX. (1869.)

It is acknowledged by the Canonists that most of these Councils were called at the instance of the civil power: but they imagine that the authority for the calling was Papal. They do not well explain the fact, that some were summoned against the Pope's wishes: and again that the civil power refused at other times to allow Councils, even when urged by Rome. But in truth their whole theory here is fictitious and at variance with history.

periodical meetings of all its prelates. The first of these great meetings provided, therefore, for constant minor Synods, as aforetime, in all the provinces: not, indeed, to order such vital and lofty matters as the great Councils had to consider; but to arrange (in harmony also with the State) the whole administration of the body of the Church in every place as a Spiritual Society. Twice a year the bishops of each province were ordered, according to the custom of former ages, to meet to seek the continual guidance of the Divine Spirit, in superintending the affairs of all the districts around them, each with its single bishop everywhere. To that Provincial Synod every one was responsible as before; only the State now enforced the responsibility. If disorder prevailed in any Church, it was for the Provincial Synod to remedy it. If any See were vacant, it was for the Provincial Synod to find and ordain a holy Bishop acceptable to the people in every case, if possible. Even if the unity of the Faith were anywhere endangered, it was the work of some greater Provincial Synod, with the chief Bishop or Metropolitan at its head, to arrest the evil; and, with the assistance and authority of neighbouring Metropolitans or Patriarchs, not indeed to define anew, but, to maintain the ancient Faith.

35. But beyond this, it was held to be binding by the universal admonition and custom of the Church (and then also of the State), that every Bishop should hold a Synod of his diocese once every year and before his visitation. At this Diocesan Synod, the Bishop alone could decree anything; but his priests might speak and advise, and his laity might be present—for they were as deeply interested as the clergy: and if anything proved to be unsatisfactory, the half-yearly meeting of the Bishops of the Province should remedy the wrong.

Such had been the practices, and such the principles of the first 300 years of our Faith, and as such they were in the next age received by the civil power. But there was a modification of the second order of Synods, *i.e.* the Provincial, to which we must turn our attention.

Several Provinces, as time went on, might co-exist in one nation; and a Synod of the whole Nation might be then summoned. This was locally termed a "General Synod," though the phrase was used in a restricted sense, and of course such

a Synod had not Œcumenical powers. It could not authoritatively define the Faith. Convened under its own Metropolitan or Primate, and always with the concurrence or by the authority of the Monarch, the National Synod had the greatest dignity among Provincial Councils. As their position and action brought about other changes in the Church's self-government, we must here describe them, and especially our own.

36. Great National Synods, indeed, prevailed at once on the break-up of the Empire. The case of England, which of course concerns us most, is not different from that of France or Spain at that time: and it will be of use to diverge briefly to our own country. We may define four gradations or periods in our National Conciliar action: the Saxon, the Norman, the Plantagenet, and the Tudor. Spelman, Lyndwood, Wilkins, and Cardwell, will furnish us with sufficient materials concerning these to guide our judgment; and by them we may become acquainted with the kind of development of Synodal action known from the beginning of the formation of our modern European society.

We must not look then, during this period of a thousand years or more, for many Synods of a purely spiritual character at all. That character was modified directly the State undertook, at Nicæa, to correspond with and carry out the decisions of the Church (*see Section* 30). If General Councils were presided over, and in some things controlled, by the Civil power, *à fortiori* the Synods of Nations would be subject to the same influence, and in an increasing degree. To them the dignified laity of the realm would naturally be summoned; and in our Saxon times, the king, the bishops, the earls, and thanes, thus met together for mutual consultation.

It is to be observed, however, that when Spiritual matters, either of doctrine or discipline, were to be decided, the bishops still invariably consulted and acted apart. Nor was it, in any case, supposed that even the Bishops were capable of there reopening points of doctrine settled at the Œcumenical Councils. The tacit and universal acceptance of this rule is the most noticeable feature of all the history of Synods. The Canonists express it thus:—"Auctoritas decidendi dubia ad Religionem spectantia et functio Regendi ecclesiam, non laicis sed solis Epis-

copis est demandata: attendite vobis et Universi gregi in quo Sp. Sanc. posuit vos episcopos regere Ecclesiam Dei."—(*Ferraris.*) But, notwithstanding this unquestionable acceptance of the right of the Spiritualty, it is frequently difficult in our Saxon times to say whether their "National Councils" were State meetings or Church. We certainly can no longer regard them, in issuing their canons or laws of discipline, as purely spiritual bodies, like those of the primitive age. They had admitted—under necessity, no doubt, or, may it not be said, by providential permission—the Civil government to a principal share in the direction of much which had of old been revered as the work of the Holy Ghost. It is not unnatural to think that an order of things allowed to last for ages was, as said of the State itself (*see Section* 17), at least an "Economy" intended by God for the time being.

37. The Norman Conquest in this country produced some change in the character of these "National Councils." Ecclesiastics like Anselm, anxious that the spiritual should not be absorbed in the temporal (as seemed the course of things), exerted themselves to elevate the synodical character of councils; but the result was that the successor of the Conqueror refused to allow any Synod in all his reign; but then, the utmost confusions prevailed, in consequence, both in the Church and the State.

The struggle thus begun between the two powers inevitably tended to their future separation; and in the reign of Edward I. the third period commenced. "Parliaments" of Lords and Commons began to separate from Convocations of bishops and abbots. They met in separate chambers, they divided their work, though obliged to unite in common decisions. At length the Plantagenets gave place to Tudors; and henceforth Parliaments became stronger, and Convocations weaker. Then Convocations were superseded altogether, and survived only in name.

Yet during all this prolonged attempt of the Church to use the World, and the World the Church, the "Unity of the Faith" proclaimed in the six General Councils of the Empire from Nicæa to the 3rd of Constantinople was never invaded in the National Catholic Churches. Archbishop Theodore, in his Saxon Council of Heathfield, with the king present, began with the

formal proclamation of the Creed of the General Councils. Nine hundred years later Queen Elizabeth, in her act of Supremacy, appealed to the same Councils as the standard of orthodoxy; and the "Articles," which we sign to this day, tell us that the Creeds of those ancient days are to be "undoubtedly received."

A similar progress of events might, if necessary, be watched in the nations of the Continent.

38. During the whole period which followed the first incorporation of the Church with the State—viz., from Constantine's days to ours, there thus has been not only, as now pointed out, a change in the power of Synods; not only a limitation of their action in reference to matters of the Faith; but the growth of that vast body of Laws (which we began by referring to, *Section* 2), enacted by Provincial and National Synods, widely irreconcileable at times with each other. In the fourth century there was at once an unparalleled outburst of Synodal action. It was emphatically an age of Councils of every kind. The first collection of Canons, containing all that were most generally known, is that mentioned with approval by the General Council of Chalcedon in the year 451. It is usually described as the "Code of the Oriental Church." But this Code of 165 Canons was drawn from the East. Dionysius Exiguus, early in the next century, enlarged the collection and made a Latin version of them, which, with some further additions, Pope Adrian I. presented to Charlemagne nearly three centuries later. But during all this period Canons of Synods were growing in Europe, and Asia, and Africa. They became so numerous and burdensome, that in the twelfth century a monk of the Benedictines in Bologna was engaged to draw up an Epitome of the Canons of Councils. It appeared under the title of "Concordia Discordantium Canonum." This is the celebrated "Decretum" of Gratian, which, with all its forgeries, was approved by Pope Eugenius III., and is the substance of the Roman Canon Law now. It contains about 3000 canons, or capitularies. The Council of Trent ordered this work to be revised, and it appeared towards the end of the sixteenth century in a little better form. Other collections of Decrees, Decretals, Extravagantes, and Constitutions of various kinds have grown around and upon these; and each local Church has further a body of its own traditions to be added.

39. The States of all Europe have shaken off, or are shaking off, that vast body of law. The two polities, the Church and the World, may in no distant time have to act independently. The Church has had the educating of the State 1500 years; and if the State has sufficiently profited by this, it ought not to be disorganized when the two powers come to act apart once more. As the Jews in captivity educated the nations, so the Church in her establishment has educated the State. The State in that case would have to take charge of the outer moralities of the community; the Church to deepen the inner moral life in individuals. Morality and Religion thus may not separate, but rise together. Only spiritual means of securing or persuading obedience to its laws will remain to the Church: and the State will be able to make no forcible secular use of the spiritual influence of the Church. The Church, raising the inner life of the individual, will raise the public opinion of the World at last, and elevate the outer morality of government. If Synods meet as freely as any other meetings, they still will rely on the inner grace of their Divine life for all the efficacy of their decisions; but they will give the State better men to be governed. Possibly Christians will never need again to meet in General or Œcumenical Synod. If even those great Six Imperial Councils proclaimed the incompetency of all Synods to touch the Creed, the Chief Teachers of the Church can never, at all events, have authority to attempt it in local Synods, without coming under the ancient anathema against even an "angel from heaven" who should come with another Gospel. (*See Mr. Ffoulkes' pamphlet on the 'Index,'* p. 71.) Synods will be but for organization, and spiritual self-government.

40. At the beginning of such an era as that which may now be before the Churches in many parts of Europe there are fully sufficient considerations to allay undue anxieties as to the "one faith," the "truth as it is in Jesus." The spiritual authority of Synods, however large, can never undo the past, never unteach the Creeds, never "untrue the truth." Strictly speaking, no Synod from the beginning has had any power to do anything concerning the Faith itself, but to testify to it. To say that a Provincial Synod could not by any new decree of doctrine "bind the conscience" of Christians is but little; for the same may be affirmed of the Œcumenical Council also. We do not believe the

substance of the Creeds on the mere authority of Synods, however great; but because they are true, and have been delivered always as the precious Revelation of God in Christ. Even the doctrinal subjects of the greatest Synods are limited. The verity which the holy fathers sought to express in the Six Great Councils was objective theology, and fact. To compare the Creed of Chalcedon with the primitive symbol of Aquileia, or with fragments remaining in any Churches from the days of the Apostles, will fully evince this. Thus it is doubtful whether an Œcumenical Synod would ever have thought it right to define the inner life of the kingdom of God, as involved in the work of the Spirit and the will of man. Certainly they never attempted it: and such Provincial gatherings as those of Orange or Toledo, which made decisions on the doctrine of Grace, and the condition of the departed, did but exceed their own powers, and harm those who recognised them. Whatever guidance as to subjective truth may be given by the Church's teachers in Synod, can never be *de fide* as to dogmatic expression.

Not only every local Church, but every Christian in its communion, may rest in Divine and infallible security on the unshaken Creeds, and the undying Sacraments of our life. The unity of the Faith and the essential unity of the Body are alike cared for. Councils Œcumenical have told us what the regenerate conscience, in its love of our Lord, ever knows, that the old Creeds are all-sufficient; and that the "law of our endless life," in the uniform Sacraments of His Grace, cannot fail to knit us as one Body, abiding in Him, our Head, from the hour of His departure on Mount Olivet until once more He shall return and "all His saints with Him." Heresy may cut itself off from the faith; and schism may be cut off from among the faithful; "nevertheless the foundation of God standeth sure."

The business of Synods hereafter, though first and "before all things they must *hold* the Catholic faith," is, in the main and practically, to organize the faithful. Christians are one body in each place, under its one head ministering the jurisdiction. "Other foundation no man can lay," but "let every man take heed *how* he builds on it." "Apostles, pastors, teachers," are given by our ascended Lord as His Gifts, for "the perfecting of the Saints, till we all come, in the unity of the faith, and to a perfect man, the fulness of the stature of Jesus Christ."

41. It may be said perhaps, and truly, that this work of disciplining the Church must be of very fearful magnitude; and that the various Churches, under their countless Bishops throughout the world in every age, might seek for some general bond of union, holding them together as one, or would otherwise be in perpetual danger of opposite disciplines and of breaking into separate congregations. The latter reflection disappears when we come to look at it. The need or advantage of any outward regime of unity for all the living Churches is a speculative idea to which is opposed the fact that Divine Providence has always thwarted any large attempts towards it. All the physical, local, national, geographical, and linguistic distinctions of our world, binding on us in nature and providence, absolutely prohibit the unspiritual theory of the visible oneness of a hierarchy of any one living generation of Christians. If indeed it could be obtained, it could not be an organization bearing any relation at all to the Divine theory of the Church; which is a whole, with some of its parts withdrawn at present to the invisible state. And not only would the completion at any time of one Great Hierarchy of all living Christians be a heterogeneous accident, independent of the Religion of the Apostles, and, in fact, uncalculated for in the "new Creation;" but it would be no visible reality, after all, for the generality of Christians anywhere. It would be a matter of remote apprehension to all but a few; and the millions would then, as now and always, have to accept the alleged fact, and all else, from their immediate local observers and teachers. There are certain dreams of "corporate unity," which are not only dreams, but hallucinations, at variance at once with fact and possibility. To dismiss them is a necessary step to practical life. But still, with the magnitude and importance of the Catholic discipline we cannot be too deeply impressed.

42. All discipline, all rules for Christian life, must have much that is special, changeable, and it may be even local; and though we may wisely aim at similarity of action, and therefore keep ancient precedents before us, we must remember that our own times and circumstances belong to our responsibility, and that the Spirit of God in His Church has not bound all coming generations by every rule of discipline which was suitable to a former time. No Church on earth acts on all or half the canons

in Dionysius Exiguus. The attempt in the Church of Rome to construct a consistent and rigid body of Canon Law out of all the preceding codes is a gigantic monument of self-confessed failure. From the Apostolic Canons to the Decretum,—from the Decretum to the Syllabus of Pius IX.,—there is no unity except as to the one Faith, and the one Sacramental life. Nowhere is the discipline of the Canon Law obeyed, or in a condition to be obeyed, in all the earth. Rome herself, in the diversified practice of nations and orders in all her Communion, is our witness that discipline is local and not catholic, or even expected to be everywhere exactly the same.*

But if it were possible, in anticipating the duties of the Church's future, it would still be ungenerous to take leave of forms of civilisation to which Europe has in various and imperfect ways been used for 1500 years, without recognising not only their Providential significance, but their place in a philosophy of human nature. Let us not imagine so crude a thing, as that modern society has been built up on an entire series of mistakes. We might rather ask whether the course of civilisation might not from the first imply much that Providence has so evidently permitted.

43. It is easy to point out that the populations of the West, from the time of the establishment of Christianity, have been very far below the religious and ethical standard of the Gospel. The conversion of whole nations at the chieftain's bidding, we see at once could not be more than superficial. The ecclesiastical subjugation of widely remote provinces by the hardy and credulous circulation of such frauds on conscience as form, we may say, even the substance of the Roman canon law, we feel to be debasing. But something is to be said in behalf of the former; and in explanation, if not extenuation, of the latter.

As to the former—the great National Conversions—it should be remembered that much is gained to civilisation when the general acquiescence is secured for any onward movement. By those great national conversions, the unreasoning public opinion of semi-barbarous multitudes was brought to the side of Christian

---

* This is so important as to be worth showing at length in an historical Essay on the working of the Canon Law from Justinian to Charlemagne, and from Charlemagne to the French Revolution, and from the French Revolution till now.

virtue and Christian organization. Had the Gospel only advanced by the sanctifying of individual souls, the progress of human nature from heathenism would have been indefinitely prolonged. Just as the Pentecost lifted thousands at once above the level of existing Judaism, while the development of spiritual life still remained for the individual responsibility; so the mediæval conversions raised nations above heathenism, and gave the world a better sphere for probation and a surer foundation for progress.

Indeed there is a distinct danger that, if the State withdraw from politically ministering to Christianity before the individual morality is sufficiently pure and strong, there may be some serious disintegration of society, and so too a grave hindrance to the action of religion even on individuals. Men are often wont to think in masses still—(in enthusiasm at a Council of Clermont, and in panic as on many a battle-field), though they are responsible as units. The anxious, if not overwhelming, problem for those who would precipitate the separation of Church and State is—*What is to become of the Millions*, while the individuals, capable of it, are being educated for the future?

Then, with reference to the ecclesiastical law, which was buttressed by so much of fraud and forgery and tyranny, we must not suppose that its removal will leave nothing behind but integrity and freedom. The influence of Christianity on law in Europe has been all-penetrating, and even the reckless fabrications of the decretals served some strange purpose in holding society together at certain points until better days.

Let it not be supposed that this is any apology for that great crime of the Papacy (not even yet in any degree repudiated), the interweaving into the ecclesiastical law in Europe that most unflinching series of falsifications of which the Decretum of Gratian is the flagrant monument. No; the canon law has seared the conscience of its administrators as with a hot iron. If there were no other ground for anticipating that the relations of Church and State cannot ultimately continue what they have been, the canon law, from Isidore to the Syllabus, furnishes the sufficient reason. But when we look at the vast range of mundane interests involved in that law, and at the internal organization, which is so imperative for society, we cannot but see how gigantic a task lies before those who have to supply the

State substitute, on the withdrawal of that which, until the last 200 years, has probably *expressed the conscience* of Christendom in the West. By whatever means gained, we may be sure of this: — the State cannot ultimately dispense with the conscience of man. It is the more to be weighed; because, hitherto, neither civilisation nor religion has ever greatly advanced, except by some bread or general action.

44. But to revert to our subject. Beyond all question, the structure of the spiritual Synods of the future, and their work of self-government (whenever and wherever they are declared independent of the State) must, if we would be safe, depart as little as possible from the Primitive model, the principles recognised by the General Councils. The essential Principles to be so preserved—(the *Teaching*-commission of the Spiritualty only—*Art.* xxxvii.—and the canonical submission of Christians to the central authority of their Bishop, and the canonical submission of each Bishop to the Provincial Synod which chooses and appoints him)—must consist at the same time with those needful provisions, which should be ordered by the whole body, for the common edification, and for the financial and exterior conditions of the Christian society.

45. Arrangements derived from the intermediate position in which the kingdom of heaven and the kingdoms of this world had for a long time been intermingled, will probably in future be inapplicable; everything, that is, which appears of secular origin and has but secular ends. The arrangements, for example, of so unhappy a malformation as the English Convocation has become, should not be the example of a Spiritual Synod of the future; until it can be shown that, during the thousand years after Christ, Presbyters and Bishops ever met in separate chambers, voting apart (the latter too being but a fraction of presbyters, and not the "*totus clerus*"), and that they elected their "Prolocutor," apart from the Bishops, and talked about their "*gravamina*," &c. The structure of such a system, however necessary for the time, is too much "of the earth earthy." Probably the system of "proctors" was first definitely introduced by the Arians at Ariminum. It seems even surprising that the Gift of the Spirit in the Apostolate should ever be dealt with thus; and none have deeper interest in it than the

laity. Indeed without clearly maintaining the Primitive principle of religious authority in the Episcopate, all must be confusion.

46. The Spiritual Polity will certainly be larger hereafter than in the Primitive days, and our Code may need a development hitherto unknown; in order that that which "every joint supplieth" may contribute to the whole. Those rough, tumultuous meetings extemporised in old times, in Thessalonica, Antioch, Constantinople, or Rome, are surely not the highest way of expressing the feeling of a Christian laity. There must be orderly Conventions of the whole of the people in the communion of the Church: and there must be an ascertained body in every place—the baptized, and not subsequently excluded, members of Christ. For such Conventions there are no ancient rules: and it would seem that it would accord with present instincts and habits, if Clergy and Laity met together, the Dioceses being made small — none being forbidden: the business of such Conventions frequently being to prepare the Ecclesiastical Synods for business to be transacted for the common good.

47. As to temporal things there would be a still wider sphere of work for Conventions of the Laity and Clergy. The whole administration of a district (as it is now termed a "parish") involves many partly worldly interests of pastors and people. These all would have to be defined.* For the old "established-church" notions of Patronage in livings, or State-stipends, or Freeholds held by Clergy, would be changed at once in a Free Church. All that the State can do for a Free Church is that which it does now for a sect. If any holder of an ecclesiastical position is deposed from it by the self-governing Spiritual body, through transgressing the laws of that Spiritualty, the State will but affirm, if disputed at law, the formal if not illegal decision of the Spiritual Society. Exclusion from the Society being the only extreme penalty of its self-government, it could not be that an excluded member could hold possession of the property of such a Church.

48. These considerations lead necessarily to others, which nothing but experience will familiarise to us. The laity, being the main body, can never "unchurch the Church," while they themselves are subject to its spiritual laws, according to their place and circumstances. Every one will here see how large,

sacred, and glorious a field of Christian work may lie before the primary Conventions, and the Provincial and Diocesan Synods of a Free Church in coming days. Every one will learn how surely, even if slowly, all will here find their ranks; while the Church is more and more defined from and a blessing to the World. But is civil society ready for the changes thus shadowed forth?

Our subject enlarges; and already it is no speculation for brethren very near to us: but here it behoves us to pause awhile. Let us not hasten. Nothing could assure her sons as to the future of the Church in any land, when put forth (as a vessel which had been long bound to the shore) to face the ocean alone, but the sacred fact that the Spirit of Truth and Power is with her. With Him to rely on, all must be safe, whatever trials may arise;—all, that is, which concerns the New Creation, the "Kingdom which cannot be moved." The Creed, the Sacraments, the Apostolate, all unchanged, and unchangeable,

("O fortunatos nimium sua si bona nôrint!")

we may not doubt that the future of the organization of the Church will be ordered by the Divine Spirit, Who has brought her through the troubles of the wilderness of 1800 years, and has promised to "abide with her for ever."

William J. Irons.

ESSAY III.

THE RELIGIOUS USE OF TASTE.

By RICHARD ST. JOHN TYRWHITT, M.A.,
Vicar of S. Mary Magdalen with S. George-the-Martyr, Oxford; formerly
Student of Christ Church.

CONTENTS OF ESSAY III.

Uses of the word Taste, here limited to choice in Representative Art. Religious Art exposed to suspicion.

Educational power of Art through the Imagination. Taste, in our sense, rather judgment in art than love for it.

Truth the leading note of Good Taste.

Over-refinement, as caused by insensibility to the real relations of things.

Misuse of Art for wrong doctrinal teaching; and its abuse for immoral purposes. Consequent suspicions in Protestant mind.

View of Beauty, as evil in itself, connected with doctrine of utter corruption, and asserted by sensualists as well as ascetics.

Roman Catholic Art. German school of Cornelius and Overbeck.

Italian popular "Catholic" art: Purism, ancient and modern.

Gothic principles of art not specially Roman.

Dürer and Holbein's influence on the Reformation. Dr. Woltmann's Life of the latter.

Ranke on the change in religious art after the Reformation.

Effect of modern cultus of the Blessed Virgin.

Necessary connection between personal character and artistic productions.

Art, indeed, is not only moral but spiritual. Flourishes under freedom rather than despotism.

Technical skill a non-moral element. Sacred inspirations of art, Exod. xxx.

Spiritual power, as seen in Michael Angelo and Tintoret. True Church art may find its principles in the Catacombs; distinctions between Symbolism and Representation traceable there; also between pictures of events and single figures.

Works of Mr. Holman Hunt, Watts, Stanhope, Armitage, Ary Scheffer, &c.

Right appeal to the imaginative faculties open to the Anglican Church, and not to be monopolized by Rome.

Public wish for permanent works of ornament, with well understood meaning, which might employ educated women as well as men.

THE RELIGIOUS USE OF TASTE.

As the subject of our Essay opens very wide fields of inquiry and discussion, which cannot be traversed, much less regularly surveyed, within our prescribed limits, it seems best to say a few words as to the sense in which the word Taste is to be employed. It appears a more convenient general term to use in a somewhat popular Essay than Feeling or Æsthetics. Of course the involuntary associations connected with the word in all languages, as with Goût, Gusto, Geschmack, and the like, are unfortunate. They seem to indicate a Louis Quinze view of the higher mental enjoyments. They imply a material and somewhat lowering analogy for spiritual things. The enjoyment conveyed to the soul by Beauty, or Excellence, or Completeness, or Fitness, or Accuracy, or anything of the kind, is probably undefinable, and so is the physical pleasure of eating or drinking. But there is only analogy at best, and no resemblance, between agreeable sensations on the palate and keen impressions on the soul. No one would talk of the good taste of Tintoret or Michael Angelo; such praise would be reserved for their critics or their cooks.

We propose to speak of Taste as appealed to for Religious purposes by the representative Arts, by Sculpture and Painting. It might be well, but is now impossible, for us to compare their mental and moral influences with the less intellectual and more mysterious spells of Music. The analogies between composition and light and shade in the two arts are very close; and that between melody and colour appears to us of the greatest interest. What a wonderful and pathetic analysis might be made of the typical saying of the blind man, that scarlet must be like the sound of a trumpet! It seems necessary to turn from all this, partly for want of space, in great measure for want of knowledge, and to pursue some such line as the following:—

First. We consider Taste sufficiently defined as "A habit of

instinctive choice or preference, founded partly on individual constitution, partly on Education—and liable to be called into action, as we here limit it, by the sense of Beauty conveyed through the eye."

Secondly. As the object matter of Taste, so limited, is the Beautiful, Becoming, &c., so that good taste is a habit of right choice about that; and since the Representative Arts are chief means of producing that; we have to consider in what manner and how far Taste (*i. e.* good art well regulated) may be of use in Religion, that is to say, good for the individual spirits of Christian people. Also, in what manner it may be set before men; as by Architecture or Ceremonial, and more especially by the use of Fresco or Mosaic, considered as instructive illuminations to buildings on a large scale, exactly as pictures in books illustrate the books on a smaller scale.

The reasons why these latter means of conveying religious impression have been hitherto very sparingly used by the Church of Christ in England will lead us to consider the suspicion which has always hung over art in the Protestant or Puritan mind, and its various causes. Then we must take note that Protestantism at the present time is taking an entirely new line, and greatly extending its range of protest; sometimes, in fact, calling itself Positivism, and occasionally amounting to denial of all things of the Spirit, or the existence of Spirit, in the world. On this side it is argued that Beauty is a thing of man (whatever man may be), and has nothing to do with Religion or Morality. In the first degree of Protestantism, according to the severer view of Reformed Churches, it is argued, conversely, that Religion can have nothing to do with Beauty. Some deprecations and explanations will be therefore necessary to this paper, which will close with some speculations about the means and rules for using the arts for purposes of religious Instruction, rather than to excite, or play on, religious Feeling.

In the first place, then, Taste is a habit of intuitive choice, set in motion and guided at first by the instincts of the individual. But these have been modified or acquired by Education, on which Taste, as a critical faculty, greatly depends. Therefore the man's taste or the nation's taste (on which the powers of a single great genius may have the greatest effect),

variously shaped by Education, react on it in their turn. Therefore we are right in working on men's minds by means of their Taste as a part of their Education, if we can—even of their Religious Education. And we say that religious impressions, appealing to very pure and intense emotions, and awakening ideas of great sublimity, were universally connected with Art, from the beginning of all culture till the Italian Renaissance. This is the artist's view of Religion, *quâ* artist: he feels that it fills him with high emotion, and supplies him with grand subject. Again, we say that good form and colour convey impressions of all kinds with incalculable vigour and freshness to almost all men; and that they have been, and may be, made useful in impressing facts of Christian history and Christian doctrine on the soul through the Imagination. Letters act directly on the Intellect; pictures on the Imagination, on man's inward and visionary power of representing truth to himself; and right use of pictures for religious teaching is the Christian's view of Art, *quâ* Christian. Then what is the Christian Artist, and how are these two views to be reconciled? The latter undoubtedly puts Religion first; the former looks on Religion, either *pro hâc vice*, or by habit of mind, as fit subject and motive for Art. Are these views reconcileable or not?

Practically we think men do reconcile them, without any inconsistency which cannot be accounted for, either by the power or the weakness of man. Mixed motive is excusable in the matter, because it is a necessity. To desire to do one's best in God's Name is mixed motive. It is not necessarily irreligious to look into the Bible for the subject of a picture, or rather, to become possessed with a Scriptural subject, any more than to look at the Bible for the subject of a sermon, if one honestly means to preach or to paint with spiritual motive.

We defined Taste tentatively as a habit of instinctive choice both moral and intellectual, noticing that it is formed like any other habit, in course of life or education, by right practice developing original capacity; and that, when formed, it reacts on character. It is, of course, so far a moral habit, as good taste results from good morals. As an intellectual habit, it may be exercised by immoral persons, or on matter with which morality has nothing to do, as in choice of colours.

This is Taste as a critical faculty. But the word is also used popularly for *love* of moral or material beauty or excellence. A taste for poetry, painting, or music, if it mean anything, means a share of the spirit of the workman or the singer, and in this sense is creative rather than critical. It desires to produce: it is either the imaginative gift or that powerful longing for the gift, and willingness to labour for it, which most of all things tend to work their own fulfilment. For the power of hard work in developing latent force of conception and character can hardly be overrated, and is, in fact, so great as to have given rise to the saying that Genius is only a transcendent capacity of taking trouble, or a love for one's subject which accepts any amount of hard labour.

We have to do with Taste in the critical sense of the word rather than the creative. We are not concerned, for the time, as to how the Gifts of the Spirit of God bestowed on the artist* are to develop themselves. Only once in the history of mankind has it pleased God to set forth those gifts as indeed gifts of His to mankind: once only did He show to the craftsman in open vision the forms, materials, and colours through which He would be served—bidding Moses and Bezaleel see that they made all things according to the pattern showed them in the Mount. It would seem that at that time and place the God of all the earth was pleased to recognise by actual revelation of His own a great distinction which to this day lies between the Roman Catholic use of art and that which the primitive Church recognised from the first, and which the Anglican would gladly accept now—the distinction, in a word, between Instructive Symbolism, use of emblem *bonâ fide* for the education of simple people, and Idolatrous Symbolism, or the reduction of emblem into literal representation of Deity, for the worship of simple people. On this we must dwell towards the end of this paper, in considering what forms of Art the Church of Christ in England may rightly admit into her temples. For the present, general ideas connected with the words Taste, or Good Taste, are before us. Ἀρχὴ τὸ ὅτι; let us take good taste as we find it in good men, that is to say, in fairly educated and faithful Christians.

---

* Exodus xxx.

The leading "note," or characteristic, then, of Good Taste, as observed in a man, a school, or a society, seems to be the deep and fine sense of Truth. This is its regulative principle; as has been said, it originates in the Love of Beauty, or let us say, less correctly, of Excellence or Fitness. Rather than distress our readers with Objectives and Subjectives, we will call Subjective Truth, Sincerity; and Objective Truth, Reality, or accurate resemblance to Fact. Our second and subordinate note may be said to be Temperance, under which term we include personal humility;* the self-respect which understates its claim or case; habitual acknowledgment of one's ignorance of other men, and of God's ways with them; moderation, self-command, coolness in accurate statement, and all qualities which enable a man to see a thing or a thought best, and present it to others with absolute justice and rightness. Hence the note of Moderation is subordinate to that of Truth; the facts of a case must govern and limit our description of them; but practically the laws of moderation must exercise great control over the individual man, always assisting his tact and charity in judgment of Truth, and modifying the extent to which he will proclaim the Truth. And here we may note that the moral element is felt to prevail in matters of Taste, and sincerity atones not only for inaccuracy but for incongruity. David's indignation against the slayer of the ewe lamb is piteous in its inconsistency; yet it conveys no sense of bad taste to our minds. As Mr. Ruskin observes, it would have done so if he had asked Nathan who the offender was, and shown fear or cunning.

It is to be noticed that we ourselves, in conversation apply the words "bad taste" to actions of great moral wickedness; not only in ironical suppression of feeling, but implying that

---

* Humility is founded simply on true knowledge of the real state of things, not on self-depreciation; nothing can be more useless or more subtly conceited than attempts to make oneself worse than one is; because to do so involves a claim to superior self-knowledge. For the connexion of good taste with truth; it is not easy, for example, to see, at first, the connexion between the exceeding meek words of Moses, "Enviest thou for my sake? would God that all the Lord's people were prophets," and his sense of truth. Yet none can really be more certain. The prophet was perhaps the only man in the host who had an adequate conception of the real greatness of the gift which he and others had lately received. He alone knew that envy of Divine gifts is impossible to any who rightly receive them; because of their infinity.

the man's instincts and intuitions ought to have taught him better, and that his action stamps his whole nature with a mark of baseness. In the same way we adopt Mr. Ruskin's view of Sensibility and Insensibility being the distinctions between the "gentle" or rightly refined, and the vulgar or unrefined man; the one comprehends the real state of things, and can adjust the balance of praise or blame, love, or their contraries, and the other cannot. Over-refinement is bad taste, because it implies insensibility to the true relation between great things and small, and the self-conceit of a little mind, unconscious of any standard except its own. It may also imply too great knowledge of evil, or thoughts coarsely employed. In some finical imaginations, insensible to real relations of things, a conventional solecism would ruin a saint or a hero. Let us only consider that most of our grandfathers were very uncertain in their spelling, and that St. Louis, Bayard, and the Brandon, with the ladies they honoured, ate not only with their knives but with their fingers. Yet, perhaps the most pregnant words ever spoken, of pure good taste as to outer dignity and ornament, are given by tradition to the most obscure of these three.*

We have said that Truth and Moderation, regulating the love of Beauty, are chief notes of good taste. The latter is dependent on the former; and generally takes the form of true Humility, or correct judgment of one's own worth (which in persons of relatively great desert is the Aristotelian *μεγαλοψυχία*). Thus it is related with religious life, through the habitual charity of judgment which it involves. But we have not to deal with Taste or Feeling as a moral quality, except to observe that not only a number of brilliant examples, but a generally high standard of it, may be found among educated English Churchmen throughout history. We have to do with the intellectual application of the Love of Beauty, guided by

---

* On the day of his wedding to Mary, Queen of France, and sister to Henry VIII., half his surcoat was made of cloth of gold, half of frieze, with the well-remembered motto—

"Cloth of gold, do not despise,
 Tho' thou be matched with cloth of frieze;
Cloth of frieze, be not too bold,
 For thou art matched with cloth of gold."

His life might be a good subject for an historical study, were it written only from Flodden to his death, about a year before that of Henry VIII., whose friendship, almost affection, he had steadily retained from youth. Hume mentions the king's remark on him after his death as the one man "who had never striven to injure his own foeman with him, or spoken any word against any."

Truth and Moderation, to spiritual thought and feeling by means of the Arts. But first, something has to be said on the connection between Art and Religion, whether it be, as Aldrich's logic says, necessary, contingent or impossible. That it is impossible, or that there is no such connection at all, is strenuously maintained at the present day, and with considerable truth in one sense: that Religion has nothing to do with Art in the sense of technical skill in producing the undefinable thing called Beauty. Our real question is how much religion has to do, not with art but with the artist: whether a man's religion or irreligion can be so reflected in his works, that they shall communicate ideas of devotion and spiritual aspiration towards the Father of Spirits, from the painter to the spectator—or the contrary. If this be true, then, under certain restrictions, the use of representative art for purposes of spiritual instruction and edification must be right. The feeling which prevails against such use of art is twofold, and is based entirely on its misuses and abuses for the last 300 years in particular.

These may be divided into two classes; the applications of art by the Roman Catholic Revival as a persuasive auxiliary in teaching false doctrine; and the applications of painting and sculpture in particular to the most intensely immoral purposes, during and ever since the later Italian Renaissance. The severer Protestant Christian rejects art as unfit to aid religion on both these accounts. On the latter account, moreover, art is claimed as naturally allied with vice and opposed to religion, by various organs of the advanced modern mind. On the Puritan side it is said, Art has no good thing in it for the human soul; on the Immoralist's, it is said there is no soul, and what you call art has only to represent the body, with principal reference to its uncomely parts. Again, Positivism, in its milder sense, says simply that no connection between Art and Morality can be proved.

It is needful for us to go into arguments on both sides: for there is no doubt that, but for the misgivings of what we may harmlessly call the lower section of the Church in England, Mosaic and Fresco, if not sculpture, would have been by this time universally employed in our churches, not only for decoration but instruction, as in St. Mark's at Venice.

On the side of the extreme Puritan it is argued, with a force

which cannot be ignored or despised, but which may be we think altogether extenuated by fair explanation: —"This sacred use of Art has been tried, and it has failed. Rome has fully availed herself of it, and to this day it is one of her attractions. The, what is called, Catholic revival of art has come, and continues in a feeble way, and it is only a bait for æsthetically minded young men and maidens. Instead of applying Art to instruction in Catholic doctrine, men have chained it to distinctively Roman doctrine; and its use is to enforce terror of Purgatory, erotic devotion to Saints, and the glories of Mary. There is no Church-Art except the Jesuitesque, and Pugin is its prophet. Not only this, but many of us have reached the stage called Philistinism, and object to the association of Beauty with Religion, or Spiritual thought, altogether. We don't want beauty or taste anywhere. It distracts our minds from the service of God and of Mammon alike. A man can't make money if his mind goes astray after ideas; and charm and aspiration will do him no good in the business of saving his soul. In point of fact, in our view, an ideal and an idol are the same thing. All mediæval instruction in the faith by fresco and mosaic was Popery: all Greek art was Paganism;*—and Phidias's Jupiter and Athene are just the same thing as the large-eyed feather-idols of the Pacific. How Beauty and man's desire for it came into the world we do not know: but it is no use here to the many unconverted, for they are doomed for ever in the world to come; nor to the few converted, for they will have it hereafter in perfection and for ever; if it *is* really a good thing. We do not want men to realise, and understand, and represent to themselves the historical events of Holy Scripture: we want them, first, to be positive that it is all exactly as if angels were dictating it to every schoolchild in the English translation, every time he reads that translation. Then we want men to know where to find all the right texts to keep themselves in our right way, and to confound all the wicked

---

[*] It is an anachronism which has done much harm to our study of Greek art and literature, to use the word Pagan of men of the age of Phidias and Pericles. The term is one of reproach, and applies to heathenism, voluntarily opposed to Christianity, not to Greek polytheism, perhaps veiling monotheism, 400 years B.C. A valuable essay on this subject, by Professor Zeller, of Göttingen, will be found translated in the 'Contemporary Review,' vol. iv., p. 359.

people who are not in it. We do not mind allowing a little trivial art: only it must not be of a character to entitle it to the enthusiasm of the wicked. We will have illustrated Bibles, after Benjamin West and Carlo Dolci; or we will shew our purity and refinement by entrusting the Sacred Scriptures to Gustave Doré. His genius and science may be forgiven in consideration of his grandly sanguinary treatment of subject. We understand severed heads and hands, and a profuse and gaudy display of the human intestines; that creates earnestness in simple readers. Rafael, we suppose, is all right, though Popish. We have heard of a man, also unhappily a Papist, called Michael Angelo; but his art is nothing but muscles; he was a mere anatomist and posture-master; besides, he is not pure enough. In short, Art or Taste are always troubling us with quantities of new thoughts: and no new thoughts, on the whole, can be safe unless they come from safe men." Then follows, most commonly, a whole hagiology of great and good men who never cared for or saw any use in Art, Poetry, or the Imaginative faculty; and they are steadily piled on the unfortunate æsthetician until he holds his tongue.

The fact is, that so many and so good men hold views of this kind (or rather think they hold them, without fairly going into the questions involved) that it is quite necessary to make all possible explanations. We are inclined to begin them as follows. As for the *à priori* view of Beauty, as not good, but the evil flower of a corrupt world, like a scarlet agaric sprung from decay of the woodland; that is irrefragable, if we grant the hypothesis of utter corruption of Man and the world in which he dwells. But that premise we deny. As to the argument, or rather assertion from history, that Art and the Love of Beauty have invariably been found in connection with falsehood, and therefore can have nothing to do with religion; against that also we utterly protest. The *à priori* argument we let alone; it may be maintained on ultra-ascetic principles, whether they be held by Roman Catholics or Calvinists; but it is riddled by practical contradictions and inconsistencies, and it is crushed by the natural feeling of all mankind. But we notice, that as a Trappist, Quaker, or Fakir may hold it because he despairs of the human spirit, so a Sensualist may hold it because he despises the human spirit. He, too,

says that man is utterly corrupt, and that he has only to act, and paint, accordingly. He is all for carnal beauty, and thinks Michael Angelo's mind was as impure as his own. His shameless expression of his view of Art and Taste will furnish the ascetic with telling objections to them.

But serious men honestly mistrust religious art, mainly on account of the use which the Church of Rome makes of it. And she is, accordingly, often enabled, through Puritan alarms, to warn Anglicanism off, and claim religious sculpture and painting as her own. Let us then see if Roman-Catholic art is all art. There are two modern branches of it, which may be roughly called the German and the Italian; the school of academic and learned piety, and the practice of Art made easy or striking to the "simple" tastes of the people. These are at present the zenith and nadir of Catholic art, so called. There are the labours of Cornelius and Overbeck, who resigned their fathers' faith for the sake of offering such genius as they possessed to the service of the Church of Rome. Whatever our estimate of their original powers may be, they dedicated them faithfully to Roman Christianity. They did not give themselves altogether to promulgating the Divinity of the Blessed Virgin. Overbeck's work is better known in England than Cornelius's: but the great Last Judgment by the latter has been engraved, and will give a fair idea of the master. In thinking of him and of it, we are somehow reminded of a recent occasion, when it became our pleasing duty to read and pronounce on the merits of certain Sacred Poems, written by Oxford graduates for a recently established prize. The best of them bore a certain inferior analogy to the works of the German Frescanti. There was the same correctness; the men could write well, or draw well. There was the same careful assemblage of allusions, and labour of reading and thought, brought to bear on a great matter: there was the labour of devout men of honour, capacity and feeling, faithfully and unsparingly devoted to a worthy object. The results were highly creditable and dignified; there was a statuesque beauty in the work, in both cases. All its wants may be summed up in the want of spontaneity; everything seemed to have been read up, and authority could be quoted for every syllable of the words and every stroke of the brushes. There was Michael

Angelo's knowledge, but not his spirit; not the freshness and unmitigated force of an inventor. The men made one speak in their praise; they did not make one hold one's tongue. Such is German High-Catholic Art: possessing learning, power and beauty in no mean degree; but all of them capable of analysis, because produced by recipe.*

But for Roman Catholic art in its lower sense, as adapted to the tastes of the people; more especially as observed in modern Italy, we can here only exercise the virtue of reticence about it. It seems to be just as truly Catholic as it is artistic, neither more nor less. The doctrine of unlimited devotion to the Blessed Virgin, as Mediatrix, is about as like primitive Christianity as her images in a modern chapel are like Phidias. Or, for that matter, Michael Angelo's Madonna in the Lorenzo

---

* We leave these lines, and some which follow them, as they were originally written, although, some months after writing them, we were agreeably surprised by finding our own views almost verbatim in an 'Étude sur Michel-Ange,' by M. Athanase Coquerel, fils. It was the first time we ever saw any of that distinguished author's works on art, and we observe, with mingled feelings, in which satisfaction greatly predominates, that he has anticipated much of what we have to say in this paper. His remarks on Protestantism in art, Teutonic and Italian, fully confirm what is said here. He makes our references to Dr. Woltmann on the subject of Holbein's share in the teaching of the Reformation, and rightly asserts the Protestantism of Michael Angelo. It is of the same character as that of Savonarola, to whom the great master listened in early life, and whose works he always studied. Its positive meaning, as distinguished from its negative import, is, that personal faith in Christ, and sense of communion with Him and service of Him, which men may retain, living in close contact with the world, its labours and its confusions. It asserts itself or protests, tacitly or openly, first against the infallible authority and mediatorial office of the Papacy, secondly against the enforcement of the ascetic view of life, and renunciation of the world and secular duties as a general rule of life. In personal faith and waiting on his Lord; plying and developing the mighty genius given him; with a mind faithful and troubled, as might well be in the 16th century at Florence; supported by the honourable and deep love of the Colonna, whose soul was like his own, the great master possessed his soul to the end. Heaviness hung round it always, as round most thoughtful men who muse on the wonder of their own redemption, and the great mystery of godliness. For him God has become man, for him Christ has died. His sins are heavy upon him, and they are sins against God, his Lord, who died. Beauty, of which he has been made king on earth, is not enough for content or for rest, in the presence of sin, repentance, death, and judgment. Genius and glory do not deliver a man in the end—the faith is all. As M. Coquerel sums up the matter, "L'unique ressource de Michel-Ange, c'est Jésus-Christ." We may compare that sonnet of his old age—

> "Ne pinger, ne scolpa, fia più che queti;
> L' anima volta à quell' amor divino,
> Ch' aperse a prender noi in croce le braccia."

or, the last charge to his household, "In your passage through this life, remember the sufferings of Jesus Christ." Whatever he thought of the Vicar of Christ for the time being, he clung earnestly to whatever Christianity was possible for a Florentine in the days of Leo X.

Chapel, and the Pietas of Genoa and Florence, resemble Phidias much more than they do the painted-plaster images we once observed in Mr. Pugin's chapel at Clapham.* Invective is no more use in this matter than elsewhere; one doth not well to be angry, and still worse to say so. But as we shall hereafter notice, the principle of using art for the sake of impressing Ultramontane doctrine on the people involves absolute degradation of the artist. Holbein appealed to the thought, the reason, and the personal faith of Germany, in hard-drawn woodcut. Modern Italians try to excite equivocal feelings of devotion in gondoliers and lazzaroni by means of plaster and paint, and crowns of stars, and dead-golden hair, and crimson hangings, and wooden-gilt glories. We do not know whether a contadina may think a church more like Paradise, because it is all hung over with cotton velvet and little pink cherubs; but we are quite sure that art adapted to the "simplicity" of the people is as inapplicable to the service of the Church of England as it is intolerable to English painters. Perhaps it is a national characteristic of the English Church, that she is at least silent on things unspeakable. It is consistent with her ἦθος to appeal to the imagination for instruction, but not for excitement. She will never apply art to foolish Paradises, or ghastly Infernos; and while her creeds and practice remain, she will probably be exposed to reproach, for her absolute refusal to tamper with the madness or the dulness of the people.

The power of Catholic art, so called, may continue to be appreciated by luxurious women, and young noblemen and gentlemen who never knew a want or a day's work. The Nicene Faith has not much to fear, nor has the Tridentine much more to gain from it. It is Art which suffers, and has suffered, by its connection with Tridentine propagandism. There is just this difference between Roman Catholic Art before the Reformation and after; that before it, the artist was employed by Rome to teach men the Old and New Testament history, and the Universal Faith; while afterwards, he was used to plead for and enforce special and distinctive dogma, to soothe men while

---

* See all the older Pisan and Florentine church frescoes, Michael Angelo's works, and especially the mosaics of St. Mark's, Venice. 'Stones of Venice,' vol. ii.

Transubstantiation and the deity of Mary were rivetted to their ancient Creed. While they painted the facts of the faith which they believed, Italian workmen kept and increased the fulness of their powers, down to the days of Michael Angelo, the sad Protestant of his time and country. We submit, that there is a decay in Italian religious art, from the change in its purpose after the Reformation. How great is the difference between early Purist work, from Angelico to Francia, and the later schools; even as to subject. The Old and New Testaments are the staple subject of Old Florentine fresco, as with Byzantine mosaic: the intent of the work is plain Christian teaching. Later men illustrate Papal miracles and adoration of saints; their pictorial "motives" are Papal and polemical. And the decay of artistic power, thus misapplied, is such that it has given some apparent ground for the ultra-protest of sensualist unbelief, against the connection between Art and Religion. Good Christians, as well as deniers, may say, Here are great technical skill and Roman Christianity working together, and the result is weak after all. These pyramidically-arranged saints, with their golden heads all on one side, and their recipe-expression of irritating piety, are not ideal, but unreal and unmeaning. We can appreciate Angelico, but not those who imitate his weaknesses, only or mainly. The men we call painters have that in them which cannot be limited by the rules of religious purism. Beauty is a perfectly real thing, and they find it in the world. They see also that it is bestowed, wonderfully and terribly, on very evil and dangerous persons and things. Some great liberty of observation and record they must have. A painter ought not to paint against his conscience; but, for all that, his first duty is to paint; and to represent all beauty which Christian honour and charity do not forbid him to treat. In short, Purism ought not to exclude legitimate sources of inspiration.

This is Realism as set against Purism: and it is no doubt subject to this objection, that as infidels call themselves Protestants, so Sensualists may call themselves Realists. We cannot help it, and refer the reader to the 4th, 5th, and 6th chapters of the 3rd volume of 'Modern Painters,' where the distinctions between these classes of men are, we think, conclusively well drawn out. What we wish to suggest to him is the way in

which the Church of England has been prevented from giving more than moderate liberty (with some gentle encouragement of late) to the use of art for purposes of spiritual instruction. On one side the Papist and the Puritan have both declared —one exultingly, the other despairingly—that spiritual use of art is all Popery. On the other, all Materialism cries out, there is no religion at all, and the history of art shows that its main pursuit is sensuality and not religion. The whole end of art, said Cellini, is to paint nudity well; and Etty, also a religious man in his way, said the same.

The last regular attempt to connect all art with Popery was made, we think, when Mr. Pugin tried to show that Gothic architecture meant Tridentine doctrine. It collapsed, of course, as soon as ever men understood that Gothic was not ecclesiastical but domestic, and that in mediæval times people lived in mediæval houses. "When the pointed arch was used in the street it was used in the church, and *vice versâ:* when the pinnacle was set over the garret window, it was set over the belfry tower: when the flat roof was used in the drawing-room, it was used in the nave."* The name Gothic as given to Pointed architecture has, of course, a special meaning, different from the wider import of the word, when one applies it to Teutonic art, as distinguished from Greek or Roman. But it must be remembered that the wider use of the word is the correct one. The favourite art of Roman reaction after the Reformation, is really the bastard classicism of the Renaissance: and to this day the Italian style, supposed by the late Lord Palmerston to be that of the Parthenon, prevails in new churches in Italy, and is specially in favour with the Jesuit order.†

Now, of course the appeal which art makes to the soil has power over the soul. If Rome used so mighty an instrument to her own purposes, why should Protestantism reject it? It might as well reject the printing-press. As a means of conveying ideas, the language of form and colour is as effective a language as

---

* 'Stones of Venice,' vol. ii., pp. 98–100.

† Only one of the existing churches in Rome is Gothic throughout, Sta. Maria sopra Minerva. This, as Mr. Bryce well observes, was caused by the great number of beautiful specimens of the Basilica, which prevented choice of Gothic models, while that style was prevailing over the rest of Europe. 'Holy Roman Empire,' p. 321.

that which works by means of letter-symbols; and it is as idle as it is unnecessary to "protest" against the use of either. We and our fathers have in fact neglected one of God's chief gifts to the soul of man, and ignored Beauty altogether. We have shown why the Church had to do without it, and could do no more than leave free choice to her congregations. Realist painting, to which our whole race has a special call, was till 30 years ago utterly neglected in all its range, from naturalism or pure study of facts, which the high-art professors despised, up to imaginative effort at realising the very semblance of great events, of which they were incapable. And all the while all the powers of error or imposture were strained the other way, either to employ art on the side of evil, or to persuade men that it could only be good by the grace of the Court of Rome. The irritated Protestantism of England defied art altogether. It was a mistake; but it has been long clung to with all the national tenacity, and is another melancholy instance, out of many, of our English habit of impressing prejudices and errors with the seal of religion, and making a conscience of being in the wrong with our neighbours. But if English Protestantism objected to the proper use of art, and the Anglican Church has in consequence failed to use it, what is to be said to Catholic art since the Reformation? In the first place, that it is not the same thing as before that event. Then, it was the expression of the inward devotion of the painter: more or less intense, purer or less pure, more fitful or more consistent. Afterwards, it was made a religious engine, a means of exciting the devotion and awakening the passions of the crusader. Before the Reformation Angelico and Giotto covered their walls with histories, with sincere imaginations of real events; afterwards, Guido and the Caracci laboured over these eclectic canvasses, which possess all the academic merits; perhaps, in virtue of their entire deficiency in force, piety, passion, or the gift of colour. By Romanism in this Essay we mean the Court of Rome, the organization and measures which have always been employed to sustain its power: not the Church of Rome as a branch of the Church Universal. We are concerned with the State system with which that Church has always been unfortunately connected. And when we come to consider the use made of art by the Reforming popes, we see the vast difference between religious art unsub-

sidised, and religious art turned into an ecclesiastical or State engine. Romanism, then, had seen what pictures will do, north of the Alps. The Jesuit understood well by then, how Dürer and Holbein had worked for and with Luther. Such works as the "Indulgence-mongers" and "Christ the true Light" had been scattered "by every city and spire in the wide wide German land," and had done their work all men knew how.*

The Roman Catholic revivalists felt that they, too, must use the weapons of the painter and sculptor; and it is not too much to say that their patronage of art was one part of its degradation and destruction. The Protestant had used it in appeal to truth; they used it in appeal to excitement and sentiment. Holbein had argued, with his grim, if well-drawn, Scriptural woodcuts. They persuaded, entreated, invited, with their soft oil-paintings of saints simpering, saints crying, smiling, gesticulating, languishing—always presenting their luscious or delicately pallid faces for the spectator's adoration. In the view of the Roman revival, religious art was not the expression of imagination rejoicing in

---

* These woodcuts are now familiar to the English public, from being repeated in Dr. Woltmann's admirable 'Life of Holbein,' where the important bearing of his works on the Reformation in Germany is fully discussed; and which also contains some beautiful comparisons between him and Durer. A brief account of the two woodcuts may be permitted here, as they are a conclusive example of the theological power of drawn or painted characters, as compared with words written or printed.

"The indulgence-shop (Ablasshandel) is a powerful assertion of the efficacy of personal repentance and prayer, on which all Protestantism turns. On one side, business is going on. The beggar is crying to the monk in vain for forgiveness of sins; those who *can* pay are paying, and money down is the strict order of the day. On the other, the 'Offen Synder,' as we take it, the self-convicted man freely confessing his sin, is following David and Manasses, who kneel before Christ. This is the practical side of the Reformation protest. Its speculative side is represented in 'Christus das wahre Licht.' The lamp of truth separates it into two parts. By it stands the Lord, with willing followers crowding to Him, laity and clergy and women. He is giving them sight. On the other side, popes, cardinals, monks and doctors, all blind, are leading each other away among dark mountains, which remind one of the 'wood and dark mountains' in the 'Pilgrim's Progress.' They are headed by Plato and Aristotle, the first of whom has just fallen into a pit, and the other, dressed like a malignant and a turbaned Turk, is just following him. This points to the feeling of the time against all philosophy alike, tersely expressed by Mr. Maurice, 'Men saw that the popes were governed by the doctors, and the doctors by the Categories.'"

The subject of the various Dances of Death, and the connection of the Teutonic visions of death and judgment with Orgagna and the Pisan frescoes, and through them with Torcello and old Byzantine Mosaic art, and thence with the first Christian works in the Catacombs, would occupy volumes. Lecky's 'History of Rationalism' will give many excellent remarks, and a mass of interesting reference, whether one follows the whole scope of the work or not.

faith, but one means among many for enforcing dogma;—the painter had to serve in the great host under a discipline which amounted to slavery. But he had the helot's privilege of sly indulgence, and might introduce almost as much nudity, and meretricious charm, and theatrical horror, as he or his patrons liked, into what passed for sacred work. Two short extracts from Ranke ('History of the Popes,' &c., Bohn, vol. i. p. 377) sum up the whole distinction between Catholic art before the Reformation, and Papal art after it:—

"Religion had resumed her empire over the minds of men, but the mode of her influence was no longer that of earlier times; in the older periods her manifestations were pure and simple; in this later epoch they became fantastic, forced, and conventional. . . . The spectator is inexorably consigned to scenes of premeditated devotion. . . . It will suffice to say that over the restored art of painting the Church acquired complete dominion. By the inspirations of poetry, and the principles of a positive religion, she doubtless infused new life into it, but she also imposed on it a character essentially ecclesiastical, sacerdotal and dogmatic." This, he goes on to say, was effected with greater ease in architecture, which was more immediately vowed to her service. Here, too, the lightness and cheerful freedom distinguishing the early part of the century were abandoned for pompous solemnity and religious magnificence. The noble Gothic of Florence, Verona, and Venice, with its varied symbolisms all beginning and ending with the Cross, was now the scorn and detestation of the builder;* and the cumbrous and costly dulness of Italian or Jesuitic architecture took its place. The Romanesque temple-ship of Torcello, where the Church, with its bishop's throne in the apse as helmsman, symbolized the ark of souls, was never to be repeated again. All was to be devoted to huge piles for the exhibition of the Host; for the pitiless enforcement and unscrupulous "exploitation" of Transubstantiation in all its crudity.† In older and better days and places—as in Venice at the

---

* Dr. Lübke and Herr Burckhardt speak of the "detestation" (Hass) of Gothic in Italy in the Cinque Cento. 'Geschichte der Renaissance in Italien.' See Bryce, 'H. R. Empire,' p. 253.

† The adoption of the chief constructive excellence of Renaissance church-building (the central round dome raised over the square substructure, taken from Pisa, or even from St. Sophia's) is probably due to the desire of making a grand theatre for the High Altar. (Lübke and Buckhardt.)

erection of St. Mark's and its Baptistery—mosaic and fresco were employed in a manner which we hope any Anglican congregation might welcome on the walls of their parish church, or, at least, which we think but few would object to. For instance, we have never heard any exception taken against the Scriptural frescoes on the walls of St. Alban's Church, Holborn.* Historical Church-painting is already recognised and carried forward gloriously in the renewed art of glass-painting, which bears the same relation to a building as missal painting and illumination to a book. How different a thing it is from Papal art, may be seen by the aim and results of the latter. If you want to teach your lazzarone the worship of the Blessed Virgin as a Divine being, it is a rough and ready way to your end to set him up an image of her, such as he will either think so beautiful as to be almost divine; or still better, you may produce some battered doll and assert that it has worked miracles and is divine. In neither case do you want pictures or figures to be well done, or call upon great painters: in the first case, you want your pictures to be exactly suited to the lazzaroni-ideal; in the second, you want them, if possible, to wink, cry, and cure rheumatism. Of such works of art we need not speak; but few things, on the whole, seem to have been more fatal to Religious art than modern Mariolatry.

We gladly believe that there is a difference between the attribution of the work of redemption to the Blessed Virgin, made in the inscription beneath the Murano mosaic and the commonplace of Italian confessionals, where penitents are asked if they would not rather ask a woman to forgive and intercede for them than Christ, a man? But no one can doubt that the ultimate object of personal adoration in Italy is generally the Blessed Virgin; in Germany Our Lord Himself;—or that even the ancient mosaics of Murano and Torcello point to the Madonna as chief agent of our salvation. This is the Murano motto:—

> "Quos Eva contrivit, pia Virgo Maria redemit;
> Hanc cuncti laudent, qui Christi munere gaudent."

It may perhaps be read as no more than ascription of our re-

---

* The paintings illustrative of the Te Deum, now being executed in Worcester College Chapel, Oxford, by Mr. Holliday, seem to us to possess great beauty, and to be conspicuously *unexceptionable*.

demption to the Virgin-Mother as an instrumental cause. But anyhow it is far different from the modern Italian view, which substitutes her for Christ the Lord, and regards Him either as the Bambino, a helpless appendage to her image; or else, with Orgagna and Michael Angelo, as the damnatory Rex tremendæ majestatis, a being of infinite terrors—not the Saviour, but unsparing Judge of mankind.* There is a difference, again, between that highest and deepest reverence for the Maiden Mother of the Lord, as such—the reverence which is felt in Germany and England—and the Italian habit of addressing continual prayer to her as mistress of the providence of God, director of human events, Lady of Earth and Star of the Sea.†

Whatever may be done for Tridentine dogma by thus employing Art in its service, it dwarfs and destroys Art, because it drives out of her circle all men of original or powerful mind and conscience, and rejects their energies and their work; for a certain independence, freedom of thought, unconscious Protestantism

---

* For the gradual increase in severity of view, and transition from the Good Shepherd of the Catacombs, to Orgagna's Byzantine ideal, followed by Michael Angelo, see Lecky, Hist. Rat., vol. i.

† There are some observations on the popular cultus of the B. V. in Rome, and its real nature, in Dr. Story's 'Roba di Roma,' vol. i., p. 218, ed. 1863, on which this distinction is founded. The passage is somewhat painful, and we do not quote it; but its whole tone is that of a fair acute observer, saying what he knows. The Roman Catholic reply would be, of course, what it always is, first to deny, and then to justify everything.

Compare also Ranke, of the reappearance of miraculous images, &c., between 1572-90, *e.g.*, of a speaking image of the Virgin at S. Silvestro, at Rome. 'History of Popes,' i. 385.

Compare again the eloquent plea for the use of images quoted from a learned Hindu by Professor Max Müller ('Chips from a German Workshop,' Pref., p. xvii.). "Thousands of texts in the Purânas declare there is but One God, "who manifests Himself as Brama, "Vishnu, and Rudr (Siva). If, firmly "believing as we do in His omnipotence, "we behold, by our imagination in an "image, *any of His glorious manifestations*, ought we to be charged with "identifying them with the matter of "the image? If, at the sight of the "portrait of a beloved and venerated "friend," &c.

This is the universal refinement of the upper and inner circle of image-worshippers: and it turns on the distinction between image-worship and fetichism. We apprehend that praying to one image of a beloved and venerated saint rather than another, because one of them can cure your complaints and the other cannot, is fetichism, and is not right use of the imagination. Portrait-images are not supposed by their adorers to be real portraits, actually *like* the faces and forms of saints as they lived, we believe, except, perhaps, in the case of the traditional portraits of the Greek Church (see Didron, &c.). A picture of a Crucifixion, for instance, is a different thing; that *is* "an image of one of God's glorious manifestations," and we apprehend that the use of it in Anglican churches is both safe and consistent, because it represents an *event*, and does not use beauty to excite personal devotion to some person who is not God.

hangs about almost all of them, willingly though they may conform to rules. Of old, when convents were, on the whole, places of purity, labour, and devotion, you could train John of Fiesole or Baccio della Porta into your Angelico or Bartolommeo. Even in the midst of doubt, scandal, and sin, you can hide away your Mabillon pure almost from all evil, although you must employ him in amassing learning, and no creative work. But can you keep your Buonarotti in a convent? First bind Behemoth, and make Leviathan a sport for nuns. Passive obedience was not in him, even to the chair of St. Peter.

We suppose the religious art of Rome for the time ought to be canonically defined as that which the Pope patronises. One of the many interesting things to be found in Grimm's 'Life of Michael Angelo' is the author's intelligent descriptions of the behaviour of various Popes to the great master. Sixtus IV., the soldier, honours him greatly, or quarrels with him fiercely. Leo, the elegant Pagan, simply neglects him; and the harsh Caraffa, restorer of the Inquisition, and heavy binder of burdens at Trent, employs the unresisting Daniele de Volterra in painting breeches over the convulsed sinners of the Sistine.

Michael Angelo made a remark on this occasion which may do to introduce what we have to say on the reconciliation of what may be called the human and the Christian view of artistic power: "Let the Pope reform the world, and then pictures will reform themselves." For every man's feeling in art, and consequently all his best labour in it, is the outcome of his own personal character; the religion that is in the man will come out in his work. Such as Pope or Church shall make a man, such will be his attempts at creation and expression. For good or for evil, out of the abundance of the heart the mouth will speak and the hand will draw. Any man who can draw will tell you that the words severity, or force, or tenderness of line, light and shade, have a moral or quasi-moral meaning to him; as real and true a meaning as straightness or crookedness, blackness or whiteness. There is power, or tenderness, or subtlety, in the man, and it comes out of his fingers inevitably; and, say what you will, the man's faith does give him power, and tenderness, and subtlety of thought. It is true that the period and the region have indefinitely great influence over art, but they only influence it by modi-

fying the characters of the men who produce it; and thus Christian art or work will be, in the first instance, the art of Christian men, and should not, as a term, be understood to express only "religious" works in the conventual sense; while in its widest meaning it should include all work done with Christian purpose. "The ways of well-doing," says Hooker, "are in number even as many as the kinds of voluntary actions." All work ought to be Christian work, in a wide, but perfectly real sense.

Thus far we have made answer on behalf of art to English Protestantism, or that of Catholic Christian belief, as against distinctively Roman doctrine. We have defined Protestantism as sense of individual responsibility, and personal adherence to God in Christ. This seems to be the positive sense of the term: but, as has been so often noticed, the word Protestantism itself means not belief of anything, but refusal to believe. And there is, as Carlyle says, a far different Protestantism, entirely negative, which resulted from the great success of the Papal reaction, especially in France. We have to deal with the Protest of the Revolution; with unmitigated denial, actual or logical, of every spiritual hope and existence. It denies the greater and the lesser inspirations alike, and refers genius to love of beauty, and love of beauty, in the last resort, to bodily passion. In the view of materialism, art is an efflorescence of sensuality. No excellent spirit ever was given to man, because there is neither angel nor spirit.

It seems to us that M. Taine's way of accounting for the great works of the early Renaissance is an example of this determinately non-spiritual view of art. But it is simply inadequate. Great men and their works are not accounted for by analogies between the periods in which they flourish, and the places in which vines flourish; nor are grand drawing and colour essentially connected with lewdness and wickedness, because a wicked man may be a good draughtsman and colourist. A bad man's sense of beauty may sometimes be the best thing left in him by evil life and teaching: perhaps the last-continued efforts of a Spirit still striving with his corrupted nature. While he retains the spirit of the artist, he will be capable of admiration, which is akin to aspiration, and to seeking things above him. His admiration of Michael Angelo somewhat redeems Cellini.

No general reader of modern literature can doubt that there is a strong tendency to set up all the chief fruits of human progress as unconnected with the Christian faith, and as pure inventions of man; in no real sense derived from a Divine Giver, Father of Spirits, who claims, in the Christian mind, to be the source of the wisdom of witty inventions. We must not speak here of unnecessary oppositions between Science and Theology; we hope, indeed, that they are settling into a general boundary question, and that it begins to be allowed on all hands that a man who is a seeker of truth may also be a seeker after God. But this we know of Art also, as distinguished from Science, that it is like higher spiritual things,—that it is, and that it defies analysis; tests and scalpel will not show us how the inner fountain springs. You will not really have mastered the laws of beauty till you can teach any given pupil to keep them all, and produce beauty by rule.*

Then there are vague opinions about Art's being a kind of product of slavish luxury, nursed up by popes, and murderous kings and nobles. As if all human power were not subject to be abused: as if God had not from the beginning given man the fearful power of turning His gifts against Him. As if Phidias had lived under Ptolemy and not Pericles; as if all the schools of Teutonic art did not begin with the wild Lombard bas-reliefs of Lucca and St. Ambrogio, and with the griffins of Verona; as if they were not perfected in free Florence, by Masaccio and Ghirlandajo; as if Michael Angelo was the creation of Lorenzo, instead of his Vates Sacer; or as if Savonarola had not loved Art as well or better than any Medici; as if the last splendid sunset of painting had not shone over yet independent Venice. As if

---

* Two remarks by Professor Goldwin Smith, in his 'Lectures on History,' are of great value here when applied to Art as a part of History. "We must guard against physical metaphors in talking of history; they bring with them physical ideas, and prejudice our view of the question. Men do not act in masses, but in multitudes, each man of which has a will of his own, and determines his action by that will, though on the same motives as the rest" (Lect. i. p. 26). And again, "Let those who have studied the science of man and history predict a single event by means of their science; let them even write a single page of history on its method; let them bring up one child by the rules for directing and modifying moral development which it gives. Has the true key to human character been found? Then let a nobler type of character be produced. Apply the science of humanity, and produce a better man." See also Max Müller, 'Chips from a German Workshop,' vol. i. p. 350; on M. Rénan's parallel misuse of the word Instinct.

men like Cellini and Salvator sprung up of themselves in the Renaissance in the full contrast of their technical power and their moral ruin; as if they too did not inherit their science through Masaccio, from the schools of the Gothic painters since Giotto.

As the subject of the connexion between art and morality cannot be exhausted here, we may deliver ourselves in the matter in a practical way, *valeat quantum.*

1. There is no morality in the technical or material part of art, nor in the technical nor material merits of a picture. Benjamin West was a very good man, no doubt, but no great painter; and whatever we may think of the Antiope, there is no doubt that Correggio was a king of painters, though he may have been a bad man. The rules of art as means for producing effects involving Beauty, are as independent of morality as are those of perspective, or colour-grinding, or brush-making.

2. Every artist, however, armed with his tools and his skill, is a moral agent: he is not a skilful machine, but a man made in God's image, fallen from that image, with prospect of full restoration to it in Christ, and able to stand in the way of or promote his own final restoration by everything he does, including his pictures. If he wants to sell them at a fair price, he does well. If he means to help others with his profits, that is better. If he also paints with delight in his subject, with what some call verve and others love, he does better still. If he labours on a beloved subject with zeal to tell others also what is in his mind about it; if he works with hope to do good teaching or exhortation, then he does the best thing a man can do of his own choice. And if his subject seizes on him and possesses him, so that the thoughts of it are a spiritual agency on his spirit, so that his highest skill is strained without sense of toil, and his highest powers of mind brought out involuntarily—so that his soul breaks up within him like a fountain and he forgets himself and his personality altogether—then he labours beyond his normal powers, because power not his own is put on him; because he has a share of that excellent spirit and wisdom of God given him, which was given to Bezaleel in old days. And he to whom thoughts and inner visions and aspirations after things beautiful and glorious come freely and of themselves, is justified in thinking himself called to the Ministry or Service of embodying them and working them out.

3. It is historically true that the representative Arts were applied to sacred use from the first; while their inspirations are distinctly referred (Exodus xxxi.) to the Divine Wisdom, the Kochmah; and the Spirit of God, Ruach Elohim, is said to have moved the soul of the workman, as He moved on the face of the waters. Every sacred form and colour, from those of ordinary furniture to the Ark, the candlestick, and the mystic Cherubs were impressed in vision on the thought of the Prophet; God commanding him to mould, carve, paint, engrave, and inlay, thus and no other way, according to the pattern shown in the Mount. And He put His Spirit on the craftsmen also. Christian art really dates from Mount Sinai, and the soul of man in his earliest worship went up in the production and dedication of visible beauty. How passing strange it is that all this should have been, at length, forgotten or repudiated in the Italian Renaissance, and that Art should have passed from the service of God to the service of Belial and Lucifer in half a century! This is, indeed, no age of faith, but of such intense and bitter denial, that men desire to see no spirituality in the lesser gifts of the Spirit of God, and degrade Art into carnality for fear of her bearing witness to her true service. Great works to this day cry to all men, Who made those who made us? Behold we are Thoughts: where we are, there are the traces of Spirit: what material law or sequence could ever make canvas and marble live and speak without a word, as we do?

4. But for visible evidence of spiritual power we refer to the yet existing works of two men, Michael Angelo and Tintoret. Volumes have been and may yet be written on both. But it is a fair answer to those who say* that Art ought to represent Body rather than Spirit, to ask them, If this be so, why is the misnamed† statue of the Duke Lorenzo, at the head of Christian sculpture, the greatest work since Phidias? The Sistine Eve shows Michael Angelo's power over pure beauty; yet he con-

---

* This is borrowed, with an alteration, from an article of great ability, called "Art and Morality," in the 'Westminster Review,' January, 1869.

† It really represents Giuliano, uncle of Lorenzo of Urbino, the subject of the opposite statue. Their dispositions were as opposed as the expressions of their portraits: Lorenzo being energetic and brilliant, Giuliano a prey to constitutional melancholy. (See Grimm's 'Michael Angelo,' vol. i. p. 417, Bunnett's Transl.)

stantly dispenses with it, and especially in this tremendous statue. It is ugly from head to foot: it prevails over the soul by means of sheer greatness, overpowering and indefinable. It is one of those works before which men are silent as in presence of a spirit greater than their own spirits. The attendant images of the Night and the Day of the Life of Man, his Dawning and Evening, may be taken with it; and so may the Moses who sits for ever with bent brows in S. Pietro dei Vincoli. With them stand the Crucifixion, the Paradise, and the Last Judgment of Tintoret. Painters and sculptors have sworn for centuries by these great deeds or documents of man's power; there is a sort of eternal murmur about their fame, and even irresponsible reviewers have to let them alone. Surely it is virtually because there is in them the witness of an excellent spirit, given to man by a Father of all Spirits.

The fact is that religious impressions are individual, just like artistic impressions. A Christian man in a serious temper will receive religious or spiritual impressions from pictures great and small. A Christian painter in a serious temper, as he is sure to be while engaged in a great work, will desire to produce spiritual impressions on the minds of men unborn, who may see what he has done when he has returned to his dust; and he will have his desire. The religion of pictures depends on the religion of painters. Personal devotion is an element of grandeur, clearness, vigour, and purity in the artist; if he be an artist, craftsman, or τεχνίτης at all. He may not be one for want of skill, and then his devotion may be out of drawing; and *vice versâ*, good drawing may be immoral. No doubt there have been many undevout astronomers who were not mad; but for all that the stars take up their wondrous tale, and produce, as they were meant to produce, devout tendencies of feeling in average men.

We come at length to consider what prospects exist of Art's being used for religious or spiritual purpose in our own churches? It is far more essential to Art than to Faith in England that it should be so used. No merely intellectual exercise, unconnected with religion, prevails widely or deeply over the English mind. Religious pictures, in churches at least, must be considered either as historical or symbolic. Historical representations of events cannot well lead to worship of actors in them: and where

instructive symbolism is, there need be no idolatry.[*] There is a direct appeal to Christian antiquity on this matter, which our Church has special right to make. Christian art and symbolism begin together in the Catacombs long before any suspicion of image-worship existed. Pictorial translations, so to call them, of the parables of our Lord seem to have come first, especially the single figure of the Good Shepherd, which the Commendatore de Rossi considers earliest of all: then the Fish appears, as typical of the individual Christian, one of the Draught of the Net; with the Vine, Lamb, and Olive. With these are associated the Fish, as an anagram, for our Lord; the Ship of Souls, or the Ark—often curiously illustrated from Pagan representations of Deucalion's Flood[†]—the Dove, Anchor, Lyre, Palm, Phœnix, Pelican, and Peacock.

This is the art of martyred men, to whom the thought of violent death for the Faith in Christ was a familiar and leading idea,—what we call a prospect in life. Of Idolatry, worship of an Image, or use of an image in their worship, they had

---

[*] The real objection of our Church to the use of portrait-images, or even personifications of any kind, is really her inheritance from the Hebrew Dispensation. Those which it admitted were symbolic only. The cherubs were not like very handsome men and women, as Greek images were; and it is from the Greek system of personification by human beauty that all modern image-worship derives.

[†] Pictures of Noah in the Catacombs have an exact analogy with medals of Septimius Severus, stamped with the Deluge of Deucalion. In the crypt of Lucina (now joined to the catacomb of St Sebastian), the Good Shepherd is repeated alternately with a woman's figure, which strongly resembles a Herculanean picture, supposed to have been copied from a statue by Calamis. It is uncertain whether it is meant to represent the Blessed Virgin, or to be a personification of the Church. In fact, Christian workmen of the earliest times seem to have made willing use of Pagan myths and emblems, as if feeling them to have had deeper meanings than any understood by their inventors; as if the old myths were not to be rejected, in as far as they had been an expression of heathen belief in God's care and interference for man. They were a part of the stock in trade of the painter, like the rules of his art, or his methods of working; and any of them which would admit of Christian interpretation were unhesitatingly taken into Christian service. Just as secular pursuits, and the labours of the year, were represented in Gothic churches in after days, so it seems to have been in the Catacombs. The work of man was felt to be hallowed by hope of Divine blessing, and therefore it seemed fit to introduce it. See De Rossi: "E uno fatto che ho constantemente notato nei sotteranei cemeteri . . . . imagino del cielo cosmico, o scene di pastorizia, di agricoltura, di cacce, de giuochi. Obvio è notissimo e il senso parabolico," &c. An invaluable addition to the literature of this subject has just been made by Mr. J. H. Parker, Hon. M.A. Oxford. He has succeeded in obtaining a series of photographs within the Catacombs, by the aid of magnesium light. They are of interest hardly inferior to those of the Jerusalem explorers: and we are eagerly looking for the completion of his costly and laborious work.

no notion; but they exchanged thoughts naturally by painted symbol. And as our Church's main appeal is to Christian antiquity, she may stand on the example of all these, who died in faith, for that liberty in religious art, limited by doctrine, which she has given her children. As has been said, the principle of using fresco or mosaic in churches is admitted by those who use illuminated windows or illustrated Bibles. But we think the object of all such illustration should be instructive, so to speak, rather than devotional. From the fresco to the woodcut, Sacred Art should cling to the awful Facts and History which it is her office to record. Excepting in necessary symbolism or permitted allegory, every representation should be felt to be that of an event, a development of God's will for man; a record of His work. "This hath God done." This principle at once removes that apprehension about idolatry which many thoughtful persons may still feel. Pictures of Saints doing something are not like pictures of meretriciously beautiful Saints standing to be adored. No one could worship a Saint of Tintoret's; none of them presents himself as an object of worship; he is himself worshipping or ministering, and is employed on his Master's work. The Church's appeal through art should be to thought and not to sentiment—and all the power of beauty may be brought to bear upon the mind, without pictorial appeal to passionate or excited devotion—which is at best an exceptional state of mind, and which cannot be played or calculated upon without great moral risk. Truth, we said, is the leading note of Taste or choice in art. Represent the Facts of the Gospel, and let them tell their own tale to the believer; consider your pictures as the plain narrative printed in form and colour. Let beauty and sentiment alike wait on truth of teaching, combined with skill of representation, which is technical truth: and let devotional feeling "as heaven shall will it, come and go" in the personal spirit of the spectator.

It remains only, or rather we have space only, to name a few modern pictures, which we consider as typical works, of a character well fitted to convey religious thought to persons who are capable of it. And, both in logic and in practice, one affirmative case outweighs many negative ones; so that the testimony of a few reliable persons as to benefit received in thought

from a picture, may fairly assert itself against a larger number who say they see nothing in it. This, however, will hardly be said of the works we shall mention: their value is twofold, as has been hinted. They are a kind of Testimony in most cases; being evidently the ripened fruit of able and thoughtful minds, given with effort and labour to sacred subject—and they also convey direct lessons in history, and the verisimilitude of history.

We mention Mr. Holman Hunt first, from the vast amount of devoted labour he has given to sacred subject, and also because the "Finding in the Temple" may be taken as a fair example of Historical Realism in Christian Art, while "I stand at the Door" and "the Scapegoat" are of the highest power of Symbolic teaching. All are Realist, be it remarked, in the technical point of view, that is to say, in clear painting of facts, down to minor details in their places. The Scapegoat also is a model of impressive landscape, only paralleled by Mr. Herbert's Sinai scene in the House of Lords. Both of them show how great attention ought to be paid to landscape backgrounds of the real scenery of Sinai and Palestine in sacred pictures, and how it has been neglected in times past, when Claude represented the great and terrible wilderness by groves of tall trees, brooks, rivers, pleasure-boats, and round towers.*

Mr. Watts's "Jacob and Esau," and other historical works, are well known; but his name is chiefly associated, we think, with the grander allegory, or with frescoes like that at Lincoln's Inn. The "Gates of Death" is a work which appeals to lofty and pensive thought so nobly, as to have great and certain, though indefinite, religious value.

A picture exhibited last year by Mr. Spencer Stanhope, called "The Footsteps of the Flock," a subject from the Song of Solomon, appeared to us a good example of the most fanciful allegory suitable to religious work. It contains a rare mixture of religious motive and artistic feeling. Mr. Millais has done much in woodcut illustration; those to the Parables are most valuable, and the oil-colour realisation of the "Evil Sower" is magnificent, though hardly suited for Church-fresco, unless as part of a series.

---

* See the "Golden Calf," &c., 'Modern Painters,' v. p. 251.

We have long looked to Mr. Armitage as a leader in historical fresco. The full severity of a French art-training has not educated him beyond his powers, and his example is most important, as the "Remorse of Judas" and the "Dance of Herodias" prove. To mention him is to refer to his master M. Paul Delaroche; and from the long list of that great man's works we must mention the small pictures of the Passion of our Lord, as, to our mind, central examples of Religious Art, and the most important pictures of their size which we know of.

Some of Mr. Leighton's works, with Mr. Poynter's and Mr. Herbert's able antiquarianisms, and Mr. A. Hughes's small pictures, seem to us to combine good teaching and good art in a high degree. But as we have spoken perhaps rather too coldly of the German Purist style of religious painting, we may conclude by referring to a well-known picture of that character, which seems to us to contain such a direct, forcible, and Catholic religious exhortation, as may reach the heart of any Christian man or woman: nor could any one be chosen which is better adapted to enforce the central doctrines of our own Church. It is the "Christus Consolator" of Ary Scheffer. The Lord sits enthroned as the Renewer and Restorer of all souls. He is the Forgiver of Sins; He speaks the words of absolution with power, as of old to the sick of the palsy. And as the forgiven hear Him, the chains of evil habit and the burdens of sorrow fall from them, and they rise and stand around, looking to Him whom once they pierced. There are types of all men and women, and their griefs; all fix on Him eyes which shall never any more turn away from Him: men and women, young and old, high and low, have met together before the Saviour of them all. We know many pictures of greater power, many of equal devotion; yet this is a great and central work of Sacred Art, or human genius exerting itself in heavenly hope; and perhaps there is none which can bring home to a larger number of minds the words which now recur to our own in writing about it;—the end of John Bunyan's vision, "And these things when I had beheld, I wished myself among them."

We must try to gather up the threads of this somewhat rambling Essay into a connected view of the proper attitude of the Church of England towards representative art.

It seems to be the right and the duty of the Church, as witness

and teacher, to use all means of testimony and instruction as to the Faith she holds. Now, in all teaching, appeal has been made from time immemorial to the imaginative faculties, by the arts of Poetry and Music, Painting and Sculpture. Thought and feeling have been aroused, and direct instruction conveyed by the latter means under various religious systems, Eastern and Western. They were employed within strict bounds of symbolism in the Hebrew Church. The cherubic forms of the first Temple, distinct from the mysterious shapes on the Ark, which were known to the priests only, seem to have been permitted as *symbolic* personifications of Divine attributes. They had their parallels in Chaldæan and Egyptian temples; and were repeated long after by Gothic Christians in the churches of Lombardy. This was emblematic teaching, pure from all image worship; and a parallel system of instruction seems to have been in use in the church of the Catacombs. Further, the workmen of that earliest Christian time seem to have tried to see all things in a sacred light, and to have adorned church walls with pictures of the labours and ways of men. We find the first Gothic sculptors doing this also with immense vigour; and as they increased in technical power and knowledge, they seem to have made stronger and more continual attempts at realised and vivid statements of historical events to the eye of the spectator. While these were done simply as records of man's conception of God's work, as statements that the painters believed that such and such an event had such and such an aspect when it took place, all was well. Our own Church may profit by such work, especially as it calls the greatest and most skilful men into her service. She may allow them to say by their Art, This is a very imperfect imagination of what some event or place may be like, which eye has not seen: and thus subjects like the Last Judgment, or others from the Apocalypse, are beyond doubt admissible. Still they must be attempted at the peril of the high-reaching painter, who may find that although art-power and devotion are consistent, they are not the same thing: that a good Christian may be a bad painter; and that a strong and skilful painter may often be unfitted for specially sacred subjects, still working as a good Christian. But, in the view of English Churchmen, it will always be felt to be both irreverent and inartistic to use painting, or any other art, in order to awaken

emotion either for or against, *on questions of controverted doctrine.* Where the right appeal is to Holy Scripture and Christian antiquity, it will not do to ask men or women to be influenced by anything else; and the Church of Rome has made continual use of that kind of æsthetic appeal in favour of Tridentine dogma. You may convince in words by argument; you have no right to do so by force of style or vehemence, or pathetic fallacy. You may argue in woodcut, like Holbein, for personal repentance and its efficacy. You ought not to permit yourself any attempt at side-wind persuasion to Saint-worship, by means of feminine St. Johns or large-eyed Madonnas; or insinuate Purgatory by images of torment. The picture of an event or a Saint doing something is, in principle and in fact, a different thing from the lovely figure of the Saint standing to be adored or dreamed over. Historical or symbolic design, in fresco or tempera, mosaic, oil, or bas-relief in all materials, based on, if not limited to, Scriptural subject and emblem, on the principles or the early work of martyred men,—is what is really desired. But, besides this, English people desire real art and permanent work of high effort, involving the best thought and skill of the best man. They desire educational art-preaching, and, compared with that, they cannot see the importance of mere church furniture, of unmeaning, transient, and non-architectural decoration. They value their money, as people generally do who have to earn it: and they like to spend it on things which will last. As to hangings, dresses, altar-cloths and pede cloths, lace, flowers and the like, *de minimis non curat Ecclesia.* If they are symbolic, their use depends on what they symbolize—if not, they are nugatory. To spend a hundred pounds on an altar-cloth, while you have capitals or brackets to carve, or mullions to fill with colour and story, or flat walls which you can make vocal with fresco, is a bad form of sacrifice, because the result is of less value. Where your ornament expresses knowledge of painting or sculpture, it is a higher thing and better offering than where it only expresses skill in needlework. Our zeal, and consequently our funds, for decoration, are painfully mis-directed sometimes, and spent in women's work rather than in men's; and the results appeal to the weaker part of the weaker sex, while they disgust the sterner. We do not in the least undervalue the zeal or the abilities of women; we would far rather have

full justice done to them. So many educated ladies in various ranks of life are capable of real artistic work, that we think they deserve better employment in Church decoration than cross-stitch or satin-stitch; and our Art-school course of study may supply them with very sufficient training and opportunities. Distemper copies from Rafael, or perhaps Ghirlandajo, or Mantegna—or even adaptations from Angelico—or from Delaroche or Scheffer—are within the reach of the best female students, and might adorn the walls of many country churches, and give heart's content and elevation of spirit to many maidens short of work. Copies in light and shade, such as we remember in Mr. Butler's schools at Wantage, and elsewhere, would have their effect on generations of rustic children; and we are quite sure that the hands and eyes which can do fine needlework, can be taught to deal with line, light and shade, very sufficiently well for purposes of instruction.

When we think of the great importance of what women have lately done in art, we cannot help being mournfully reminded of two of the early lost, who were both reckoned among the first amateurs in Europe; though neither could be called by the rather invidious name of amateur by reason of defect of skill. Both, it was felt, bore the name in its etymological sense, as true lovers and followers of the Beautiful. Those who will regret them to their end of days will not, we trust, object to this feeble testimony of regard and admiration, even from a mere acquaintance, to the memory of the late Lady Trevelyan and the late Mrs. Charles Newton. Their work was completed early and well; they pointed out and took the lead in a direction for the energies and tastes of cultivated women, which many more are now following. Perhaps these few lines may show that their gifts of genius, beauty, and charm, told in a wider circle, even than it seemed.

"Quantò minus cum reliquis versari, quam talium meminisse?" After such a remembrance, we have no mind to talk of sham Church-work, or scold foolish virgins, who taint even devotion with frivolity. Their weakness may be mere weakness, and should have some indulgence. But Church ornament is really a matter for the tastes of men, and subject to severe criticism and suspicion;—so we have attempted to lay down a few rules for it, which may bear criticism and disarm suspicion. The

principles of permanent decoration, tenderly and humbly asserted in the Catacombs, reach full glory in the mosaic of St. Mark's, and in Florentine fresco; and culminate in the mighty works of Michael Angelo and Tintoret. A time will come when English Churchmen will understand the value of that testimony of dedicated genius, which the doers of these great deeds have borne to all men. It is better for our sacred artist, whoever he is, to die following these, than to live doing genre for drawing-rooms; as much better for him, as Christian teaching is better than sentimental play of fancy. And how far better may it be for the rich patron to spend his abundance on a fresco, which may bring out a noble workman in the doing, and itself, when done, appeal to Christian thought for centuries,—teaching other workmen all the time,—than to buy small pictures for his private gallery, or his wife's boudoir? How far better? None of us will know, until we see the harvest of man's deeds gathered in in the end, —"Then shall every man have praise of God."

R. St. John Tyrwhitt.

ESSAY IV.

THE PLACE OF THE LAITY IN CHURCH GOVERNMENT.

By MONTAGU BURROWS, R.N., M.A.,

Fellow of All Souls; and Chichele Professor of Modern History in the University of Oxford.

CONTENTS OF ESSAY IV.

Reasons why public attention is fixed on the subject.

Question stated, What is the existing place of the Laity in Church Government?

Answer given by the Church in the United States.

Answer given by the Church in the Colonies.

Answer proved to be demanded, in England, by the general discontent, from

(1) A Theological point of view.

(2) A Social point of view.

Sketch of the place at present held by the English Laity—Royal Supremacy—The Premier and Parliament—Lay Patronage—Churchwardens—Ecclesiastical Courts—General Failure—Fatal Symptoms.

Steps which have been taken to remedy existing evils.

(1) Temporary and irregular steps—Clerical Meetings—Church Unions—The Church Institution—Committee of Laymen—The Great Societies—The Church Press—Church Congresses—The success and failure of Congresses, and their future.

(2) Permanent and regular steps—Ruridecanal Meetings, which are the units of Church-Government, but almost useless except in connection with Mixed Diocesan Synods or Conferences.

The all-important position of such Diocesan Assemblies.

The view taken of them by Convocation and Congresses entirely favourable.

Sketch of the Synods or Conferences already held at Ely, Lichfield, &c.

Why has not more been done in this direction?

(1) The *Vis Inertiæ*—The Secular Press.

(2) Obstructing causes amongst loyal Churchmen.

(α) Amongst Low Churchmen—Mr. Ryle as an exponent—Representation of Minorities.

(β) Amongst High Churchmen—Specimens of different authorities in favour of Mixed Diocesan Synods—Chancellor Massingberd—Canon Seymour—The present Bishop of Salisbury—Safeguards as to doctrine and discipline.

What is meant by questions of doctrine—Unnecessary jealousy of the Laity.

The Objectors who believe Synods will find nothing to do.

The various uses of Diocesan Synods or Conferences—Reasons for their being absolutely necessary.

The connection of Diocesan Synods with central Church Government—Not a subject of immediate urgency.

The Place of the Laity is at present to be found in Ruridecanal and Diocesan Assemblies—There is yet time to set the Church in order, but not a moment to be lost.

THE PLACE OF THE LAITY IN CHURCH GOVERNMENT.

There is, it may be hoped, something to be said in favour of a layman dealing with a question affecting laymen. It may be presumed that at least some laymen will think so. If the writer cannot expect to command the confidence of the clergy as well as if he were one of themselves, he may at least be taken to represent in some degree a class of opinions which they may be willing to take into consideration. The object of this Essay is to combine and discuss what has already been advanced in various forms by different persons rather than to propose anything novel, to attempt the removal of certain prejudices, and to further—should such a privilege be granted—even though in the humblest way, the great cause of Church organization.

It cannot be necessary to dwell at any length on the circumstances of the times which are bringing into the foreground this question of the Place of the Laity in Church Government. Some persons are attracted towards it from one direction, some from another, but the thoughts of very many seem to converge towards the same point. Is it too much to say that it is the great Church question of the day?

The sudden blow which has fallen upon the Irish Church has perhaps aroused a larger number of minds than anything else. The astonishing collapse, at the late elections, of support for a cause which, though removed from our own immediate ken, was still the cause of the whole Church, and roughly divided English constituencies into its friends and foes, has already produced a startling effect. Symptoms of what has taken place had, indeed, previously shown themselves; but the mass of English Churchmen no more believed that a branch of their own body, deriving its property and status from the same or a similar origin, would be suddenly stripped of that status and that property at the first bidding of the party opposed to it, than

the French people foresaw that the Convocation of the States General of France in 1789 was to change the face of Europe, and commence a new era for the world. Such a summons, such a surrender, such a fall, have made men think who never thought before.

Again, the increasing acquaintance of our people with Church affairs in America and the Colonies has had a powerful effect, brought to a focus as that acquaintance has been by the Lambeth Conference and the consequent visit to our shores of so many Bishops of our Communion; and, to speak of special facts, the struggle with heresy in which the African Province has been involved, the appointment of the Bishop of New Zealand to the See of Lichfield, and the interest attaching to the long process which has lately so happily ended in the choice of a Metropolitan for Canada, may also be mentioned. The Church of England is waking up to the discovery that she is the Mother Church of what must soon be half the world; and a prominent landmark in that discovery is the place which the Church Laity have taken in Church Government wherever any efficient organization has taken place.

The keen inspection which Churchmen are beginning to make into the ecclesiastical facts of their own English condition is also influencing a large class of them. The agitation which brought about the revival of Convocation has long spent itself; and, important as that revival has been in every way, it will be admitted that there is a very general belief in its being only one step in the right direction. People cannot but observe the provoking apathy with which the debates in Convocation, and the well-considered, practical Reports of its Committees, are received by the public, and their consequent failure to produce much appreciable effect upon public opinion. Side by side with this failure they observe—and here what they observe is satisfactory enough—that Parliament more and more confesses itself to be unequal to the task of interference in the internal management of ecclesiastical affairs, being now composed of persons holding every variety of religious belief, and therefore only uniting in legislation on the common ground of mutual forbearance. They observe the change which has gradually taken place in the exercise of the Royal Supremacy; they no longer perceive in the leader for the time being of

a heterogeneous House of Commons any sort of substitute for the autocratic Tudor Sovereign whose general governorship of the Church, by and through the Church, they accepted at the Reformation, with all its defects, as a refuge from the tyranny and corruption of the Roman usurpation. In short, the old machinery of the Establishment is perceived to be very much out of gear. Those who are most anxious for the retention of the great blessing of the union of "Church and State" are also those who are looking about most anxiously for some means of readjusting the relations which subsist between the two bodies, now more than ever distinct and separate. It is in the introduction of the Church Laity in some form or other that they are beginning to see a way out of their difficulties.

On the other hand, the more moderate of those who have deliberately relinquished all hope of a healthy condition of the Church, so long as it is connected with the State, naturally inquire how the assistance of the Laity can be safely secured for the new order of things which they wish to bring about; perceiving, as they cannot but perceive, that if the State is to be given up,—or if it gives up, of its own accord, the Church,—some substitute must be found, some organization on which and in which the clergy may act, so as to prevent the disestablished and disendowed Church from breaking up into a thousand pieces, or at least to secure that it shall make a fair start.

Thus from every quarter arises the same question—What is the Place of the Laity in Church Government? Let us look first abroad, and then work towards home.

The answer to the above question is given, with the greatest confidence and brevity, by the American Church. There, at least, no hesitation will be discovered. Circumstances have made its course clear. Originally planted without bishops of their own, tainted with the unpopularity of a loyal attachment to England, struggling with every possible difficulty, the American Church had no choice but to throw itself on the Laity of its communion. The result has been that, whatever fault may be found with passages in its earlier career, due for the most part to English neglect, no one can deny that it exhibits at present a very efficient, if not perfect, example of organization; that, considering its difficulties, its success, taken

in the largest sense of the word, has surpassed all human expectations; and that the part taken by the Laity in the work has had a main share in this result. Untrammelled by a single link of State connection, the whole system of Synodical action, from its primary rudiments to its ultimate development, the method of election of bishops and incumbents, and the system of Church discipline, have been worked out *de novo* with all the completeness which might be expected amongst a people trained in the freest school of representative institutions. Amidst general unity there is considerable variety in details, the different dioceses having adopted different rules as to elections and other matters. Though the State has acted with fairness and liberality in the matter of endowments, the Voluntary system, with all its miserable defects, is a leading feature in the American Church; but these defects must be charged to their proper cause—not to the "lay element" in the Church Government.* The unwavering testimony borne by every description of American Churchmen to the wholesome action of that lay element, to its superior quality, as regards character, ability, social position, and its strong conservative tendencies, is too notorious to require notice here. Whatever we may think of the course pursued by that Church in the original formation of their Prayer-Book, there is no reason to connect that course with the "lay element." The voting by Orders is always resorted to, if called for, and is a never-failing security. While, in most of the Diocesan Conventions, the Bishop has no veto, the House of Bishops in the General Convention has. No alteration in the Prayer-Book can be made without extreme difficulty; the consent of two successive General Conventions being necessary, with an interval of three years, and this after the proposed alterations have been submitted to all the Diocesan Conventions.† Here, in fact, is found practically the answer to the

---

* See a paper read by Dr. Churchill of Dublin at the late Dublin Church Congress, where the whole question is clearly stated and discussed, and a speech, at the same Congress, by the Rev. T. Fales, an American clergyman, as also a letter from the Bishop of New York, printed in Dr. Moberly's 'Bampton Lectures,' p. 334. The writer may add to this testimony the unvarying approbation of the working of the lay element, which he has himself heard from the lips of American bishops and clergy in conversation, or learnt from them in correspondence.

† An account of the Constitutions of the Churches of the United States, Canada, and New Zealand, will be found in a pamphlet entitled 'Church Organization,' by the Rev. W. Sherlock, B.A. (Dublin: Hodges & Co.)

stock difficulty as to the interference of laymen in matters of doctrine. "We do not contemplate," it is said, "any changes in such matters. We have deliberately received and adopted the Faith in a certain form. If this form is ever departed from in the slightest degree, it must be by the conviction of the whole Church, the independent action of the Bishops, Clergy, and Laity; and this by no transitory or party movement, but by the reiterated voice of the whole body of the Church, after the fullest time for deliberation."

When we turn to the Colonial Church, the extraordinary growth of which during the present generation has done more to prevent English Churchmen from "being ashamed when they speak with their enemies in the gate" than any other single fact, we find much the same answer to the question proposed. The one point on which it is most distinguished from its parent, and in consequence of which we may surely style it *matre filia pulchrior*, is the interest taken in its affairs by the Church Laity. Some starting from the first with an organization in which the Laity were included, some only adopting it when the supposed connection with the Church organization of England was found out to be a delusion, in one form or another the whole Church, and not merely a portion, has been (or is being) brought into the government of its own affairs. The great difficulty, however, which has attended the relation of the Colonial to the Mother Church has left its mark. The prevalent belief in the existence of an appeal to English Ecclesiastical Courts, the uncertainty attaching to the true meaning of the Royal Supremacy as applied in colonies, the appointment of bishops for the most part from England, and the necessity of a resort to England for a supply of clergy in the early stages of colonial existence, while they have delayed Church organization, have combined to give certain portions of the Colonial Church a sort of half-way position between England and the United States. While the Laity are represented in every Diocesan and Provincial Synod, and take as full an interest in Church affairs as in the States, there is, in one of our most important colonies at least, a proviso against their interference with doctrinal matters. Thus, at the first meeting of the Provincial Synod of Canada (though there is nothing laid down on the subject in their Church Constitutions) it was agreed to limit the

exercise of its powers as follows:—"'It is our earnest desire and determination to confine our deliberations to matters of discipline, to the temporalities of the Church, and to such regulations of order or modes of operation as may tend to her efficiency and extension.' A like limitation has been fixed by each Diocesan Synod. By this restriction matters of doctrine are excluded from the consideration of the Synod."* How far this exclusion may be necessary will be noticed further on; there is nothing of the sort in the equally organized diocese of New Zealand. It is sufficient here to observe that precisely the same tribute is paid by every one to the value of lay co-operation in Canadian Church Government as in the case of their neighbours, while the independence of the bishops seems in Canada, New Zealand, and others of the Colonies, to be preserved by means of their absolute veto in a manner which is decidedly superior to that of the United States. "The central principle of Canadian Church organization," says Mr. Gilson, "is the spiritual authority of the Episcopal Office. The Bishop of a diocese is accepted as the minister of God, bearing a Divine commission that bestows on him spiritual and ecclesiastical power, not only for conferring Holy Orders and administering Confirmation, but also for the executive government of the Church. This central principle has been partially nullified in many of the dioceses of the United States." But "it is the joint action of the Bishop, Clergy and Laity, through their representatives in Diocesan Synod assembled, which is the motive power of the organization of the Church alike in America and Canada. In the Synod the corporate life and activity of the diocese is concentrated, and through the same it is diffused."†

We pass on from the daughters to the mother. What answer will she give to the question proposed? It has been asserted that Churchmen are beginning to discover that the machinery of Church Government is very much out of gear, and that a large and not uninfluential portion have even come to the conclusion that nothing short of an entire separation of Church and State will be of any avail; while an increasing number

---

* The Rev. S. Gilson, late Archdeacon of Montreal, in a paper read at the Dublin Church Congress, 1868. † Ibid., p. 235.

of both sections agree on the need of calling forth the Church Laity at home in some way analogous to that which we have noticed abroad. We must say a few words more on this point.

It is scarcely too strong a statement to make that there is, probably, no one who is satisfied with the existing condition of things. From the Theological point of view there is the continuous complaint and common protest of Churchmen against the unsatisfactory character of the Ecclesiastical Courts. This cry does not proceed from one party alone. There is a general want of confidence in the protection afforded to the doctrines which have been inherited from the foundation of the Church. The most dangerous assaults are made, with no small public approbation, on the very elements of the Faith, and the power of meeting them seems to be gone. There seems to be a very general despair of effecting any substantial reform in discipline. Clergy Discipline Bills find their way into Parliament one after another, only to find their way out of it again amidst a general sense of relief at having escaped some worse evil while attempting to remedy the existing grievance. Royal Commissions command but little respect. Parliament does not seem to understand, naturally enough, the very elements of the questions at issue. The vicious system of Episcopal appointments which has crept in amongst us of late years, the danger which is constantly impending, owing to this system, of having some disgraceful scandal inflicted upon the Church, the mere political character which too often attaches not only to these but to the inferior Ecclesiastical appointments, the gross abuses of Church patronage in general, the loss of millions of souls to the Church in consequence of the persistent refusal to create fresh Bishoprics as the population of the country increases; these and many more grievances which might be mentioned, not sentimental, but real and practical grievances, produce an increasing dissatisfaction with the present state of things. The Bishops declare they have no power; nor is the Church, under existing circumstances, willing to give them more. Anarchy and division are rife amongst us.

From a social point of view, Churchmen are forced to regard with dismay the gradual weakening of the position which past generations felt to be necessary for the safety of the Established Church, that Church which they regard as the one commissioned

teacher of the nation, and to which they look for the moral well-being and progress of our people. One bulwark after another has had to be surrendered, while nothing takes their place. In vain, certain speakers and writers declare that the building ought to be all the stronger for throwing down all these props and buttresses. Churchmen do not find it so. On the contrary, they find rents and cracks spreading in all directions. The struggles that have taken place over Church-rates, Endowed Schools, the Universities, the Irish Church Establishment, the Marriage Laws, and many lesser points, have all ended or are ending disastrously. It must, of course, be admitted that no institution can stand still in a moving age, and that what is exactly suited to one period is not exactly suited to another; but, as far as we can see at present, the aggregate result has hitherto been to place the Church at a great disadvantage, to open the way for a complete organization of her opponents, and to obstruct her own ancient methods of self-propagation. Thus, instead of repair and reform there is simply loss and revolution. Each reverse dispirits Churchmen and adds fuel to the ardour of those who are "lying in wait for her on every side," openly avowing that they mean to "pull down the carved work thereof with axes and hammers."

If any one should think it unwise or uncharitable thus to refer to the existing weakness of the Established Church and the threats of her opponents, let him turn to the pages of the Dissenting and Roman Catholic newspapers, and to the reports which reach us from time to time of the proceedings of the Liberation Society; let him observe, what is still more significant and alarming, the sarcastic pity, or contemptuous indifference with which, as a rule, the secular press, representing, no doubt, the mass of the population, deals with the disasters of the Church; or let him at least reflect, if he has not done so before, on the series of stubborn facts which the last few years have engraved on the public records of the country. If it is wise to cry peace when there is no peace, to speak of prosperity and growth when the marks of decay are patent to all except ourselves, to pride ourselves on some particular and local success while we shut our eyes to the general condition of the whole, then the ostrich is wise when she hides her head behind a tree and imagines the hunters do not see her uncovered body, or the

prescience of the dumb victim is to be commended when it licks the hand which is raised to shed its blood.

Have the Laity, then, no voice in English Church affairs? Has nothing been done to make that voice effective?

On the first point we need not say much. This is not a treatise on the Royal Supremacy nor an historical account of the process by which the reaction from Roman corruption has issued in a general confusion of the proper relations between Church and State.* It must be taken for granted that those relations, as regards the working of the Lay Element, have become unsatisfactory; especially within the lifetime of the present generation. There is a place, of course, in the Constitution for the voice of the Laity; but we have learnt not to be satisfied with mere phrases; we now ask what sort of voice it is? Passing over the personal position of the Constitutional Sovereign of the 19th century, since it is a matter on which every one is capable of forming an opinion for himself, passing over the virtual autocracy of the Prime Minister in Ecclesiastical appointments, and other lay exercise of Church patronage, as well as—since we have already referred to it—the refusal of Parliament to meddle with the internal affairs of the Church, we find no trace of this lay voice except in the feeble and isolated accents of the Parish Churchwarden at one end of the chain, and the haughty utterance of the irresponsible Lords of the Committee of Privy Council at the other.†

The former of these, in its present condition, cannot be fairly considered any voice at all. The words "feeble" and "isolated" are not, of course, meant to convey any feeling approaching to contempt for this most ancient and honourable office. The assistance afforded by Churchwardens to the clergy, the steadiness and sobriety which, for the most part, they contribute to the conduct of our Church Services, the good spirit and good sense with which, on the whole, they perform their office, and the

---

* Perhaps the writer may be permitted to refer to some lectures, published this year under the title of 'Constitutional Progress' (Murray), for an attempt to deal with a part of this subject.

† Those who point to the exercise of the Royal Supremacy and to the Church patronage existing in the hands of individual laymen as a real and sufficient representation of the "lay-element" in Church affairs, must surely be indulging in a cruel mockery of public feeling, or must, if in earnest, have become so encased in the Hanoverianism of a past age as to be wholly incapable of understanding the present.

important part they thus play in keeping the system of the Establishment above water, need no illustration in this place. But their voice in Church affairs is "feeble" precisely because it is "isolated." Their functions are reduced by custom to the humblest limits, and their influence on the general status of the Church is almost unfelt. No common assemblies combine their experience or direct their efforts.* Each is concerned for his own parish, and that alone. Thus, in a large majority of cases, the leading persons in the parish never dream of standing for the office, and the parochial representation of the Church is by no means of the high character which the circumstances of the age require. Vestries are attended, as a rule, by an extremely small section of the parishioners, and little or no general interest, save on some exceptional occasion such as a local contest on Ritual or on pew-rents, is felt in their proceedings. All this may offer to some minds an agreeable picture of contented acquiescence and substantial well-doing; and this, though it would betray a low estimate of the Church's functions, might not be a wholly untenable opinion if the Church were commensurate with the Nation, or if those who have become alienated from her were content to preserve the ancient Constitution of Church and State. But the exact contrary is the truth. The state of things above described is therefore a fatal symptom.

It is not only a fatal symptom regarded from a common-sense point of view—the view of the statesman and the political Church organizer; it is fatal from the highest, the most spiritual, point of view. "The Church," said the Bishop of Ely in his address to the Bedford Conference of Oct. 6th, 1868, "was never intended to be, as I feel it has been too much in this country, an aggregate of isolated teachers and congregations, but a living whole. The Church for centuries proved itself to be a great organic whole. Surely we, as a Christian Church, having the greatest of all possible ends in view, namely the saving of God's Elect, the promotion of the Kingdom of Christ, and the glory of our God and King, should, in wisdom and in duty, seek, as much as possible, corporate and vital union one with another. The first end of our meeting is the unity of the Clergy

---

* The "Churchwardens' Association" rather bears witness to the want of some local and personal organization than attempts to supply its place.

one with another and of the Laity with the Clergy, and a mutual understanding. Meetings of this kind, gatherings of the Clergy and Laity, have been until of late years, I may say for centuries, the rule, not the exception, in the Church of Christ. By union alone can we escape those dangers of the most appalling character which now threaten the common faith of all Christians."

Nor will any one seriously maintain that this failure of the Laity to secure a voice in Church government through the Churchwardens is compensated by the Lay character of our Ecclesiastical Courts. That the legal element must necessarily find a place in these Courts in the persons of laymen, must be admitted; but it is a subject of almost universal complaint that the Final Court of Appeal should consist exclusively of laymen,* and thus, instead of finding what we are in search of in this direction, the less we say about it the better.

To sum up, then, the existing facts about the representation of the Laity in English Church Government, we find an organic change in the position of both Crown and Parliament towards the Church, together with the removal, to a great extent, of legislative protection, while, at the same time, the local and isolated fragments of lay government remain precisely *in statu quo*. To cease to grow, in an age teeming with growth and development, is to recede and decay. It is surely beyond dispute that some vigorous measures must be taken to bring Church organization up to a level with the age.

Have any steps been taken? The answer to this is unfortunately soon given. *Organically and generally, none.* But a great deal has been done in the way of preparing for an improved state of things. Let us briefly review what has been done, shewing which are merely initiatory and temporary measures, and which are real commencements, however slight, of the organization required.

Amongst the former class must be placed those irregular combinations which first introduced both clergy and laity, separately and together, to the idea of common action on Church affairs—the Clerical Meetings of neighbouring clergy, and, very often in connection with them, the various Church Unions for

---

* The so-called "assessorship" of the Archbishops and Bishop of London is not a necessary part of this Court, which may be held without them.

the defence of doctrine, consisting of laity as well as clergy, which sprang out of the controversies agitating the Church some twenty years ago; the Church Institution, which has done excellent service in combining Churchmen of all opinions in a common bond; and the Committee of Laymen, established for the purpose of watching the proceedings of Parliament in Church matters. The great Societies—Propagation of the Gospel, Christian Knowledge, National, Church Missionary, and others—had always trained a certain number of laymen in various fields of Church work,* and the rising circulation of ecclesiastical newspapers brought to light a large amount of public spirit which the Church movement had called forth. These newspapers also vastly strengthened that public spirit by bringing it to a focus; and, indeed, though it is difficult to separate cause from effect in such a retrospect, it may be questioned whether anything can compare with the development of the Church press in producing that desire for a better organization of which we are now to speak. Though itself a mere agent in the process, and one which cannot be taken in any sense as a substitute for regular assemblies, though open to just charges of violence, party spirit, or time-serving, it has had a wonderful effect in spreading information, exciting zeal, correcting mistakes, and providing—what is quite necessary while steam is generating—a safety valve. The loudest condemnations of it are sure to be heard from those who, having attained to comfortable positions, think things will at least last their time, and make no attempt to stir a finger in the removal of abuses or the promotion of practical improvements. If those who are fitted by their moderation and wisdom to take a lead had exerted themselves more in the development of the Church press they would have less cause to find fault with it now.

These various rills united to form the stream which bore Church Congresses to their triumphant career. Nothing has more plainly proved the existence of a strong feeling in favour of Church reform, and of the combination of clergy and laity in

---

* The number of lay subscribers has very much fallen off in most of these Societies of late years. The consequence has been that their management has fallen far too much into the hands of the clergy, by no means according to their own wish, and to the great detriment of the public in every way. The time will surely come for their absorption into a great Church organization; but it has not come yet.

Church affairs, than the concourse of persons who have flocked to these annual gatherings, and the earnestness with which the discussions have been conducted. Ever since the first small but successful Congress in 1861 at Cambridge, due, it should never be forgotten, chiefly to the zeal and sagacity of the late Mr. Beamont, of Trinity College, and Mr. Emery, of Corpus, now Archdeacon of Ely, the popularity of these gatherings has gone on increasing, and they have played a most important part in advancing the interests of the Church in general, as well as in stirring up the zeal of the localities where they have been held. That held at Dublin last year will always have a special significance, as bringing together for the first and last time the members of the two branches of the then Establishment; affording, as it did, at the critical moment, that acquaintance with the internal condition of the Irish Church which was of such service in the struggle (though of little avail in the end) when the time of trial arrived. In these Congresses the Church has learnt to perceive what her real wants are, and what are the proper remedies. The mixture of clergy and laity has worked exceedingly well, the chief defect having been as yet the inferiority in number of leading laymen in comparison with the clergy, and the consequently too clerical character which they have assumed. So well have they succeeded that there has been a danger of Churchmen remaining satisfied with them. But a moment's reflection must convince any one that they are but temporary expedients which, like Church "Unions" and "Associations," must pass away, or be more rarely resorted to, as soon as a proper organization has taken their place. The exclusion of the most important subjects of discussion which Committee after Committee finds necessary on account of the heterogeneous nature of the assembly, the character of mere talk and the prevalence of commonplace platform oratory which inevitably attaches to a concourse of people from all parts of the country without any definite status or claim on the part of any one to be heard, and especially where a large portion of the auditory consists (quite rightly) of ladies, the impossibility of carrying on any result from one Congress to another, in consequence of the informality of such meetings, (not indeed that it is correct to speak of "results" when no voting can, from the nature of the case, be permitted); all these,

and other similar considerations, show Church Congresses, as we now know them, as they have shaped themselves by the experience of nine years and the manipulation of skilful hands, to be utterly incapable of holding the position of permanent parts of Church organization. Like the Church press, they have formed and are forming excellent safety-valves, have removed some obstructions, propagated much Church spirit, united some who were previously separated, given impetus to Church work, and encouraged isolated and despairing Churchmen. Those who have devoted time and labour to them have not done so in vain; such persons have done a work of which they cannot calculate the importance; but, at the same time, Congresses have created a wide-spread conviction that something of a different and higher kind than themselves is required, and as soon as that "something" is put into shape, the agents in bringing about Congresses will find their natural places there.

Probably these general and informal assemblies will not altogether disappear; the appetite for such genial and pleasant gatherings has taken root; many who find no place in formal Synods or Conferences will gladly promote what they have become accustomed to value; and indeed one of the most valuable functions of the present Congress will be unfulfilled except by this particular mode of assembly, a gathering of Churchmen and Churchwomen in some large city which is very much the better for finding such a stir and life in its midst, for having its newspapers filled with ecclesiastical speeches and leading articles, and the abuses of its own defective Churchmanship ruthlessly exposed by candid friends before its very eyes. The Church Congresses will soon, we may hope, cease to hold the place they now hold, but they will scarcely pass away altogether. The very Synods and Conferences of which we are about to speak will require the free breath of Church opinion to be brought to bear upon them. They will offer plenty of opportunities for criticism, and will be much the better for seeing themselves as others see them.

Turning next to the movements which are real commencements of a permanent Church organization, we come across that revival of the Ruridecanal system which has attracted less attention than it deserves. Into this channel the more irregular "Clerical Meetings" have been very much diverted, and in

connection with them the "Lay Element," chiefly through the Church Institution and the efforts of the lamented Henry Hoare, has been already to some extent introduced. They are the true units of Church Government, whose value will be largely increased when the principle of election is introduced into them. This, however, can scarcely be expected at first. As the spirit of self-government takes greater possession of the Church, the demand for a share in the choice of Rural Deans will connect itself with the demand for some voice in the election of Bishops, and the appointment of other ecclesiastical officers.* As yet the importance of the position of Rural Deans has not attracted much public attention, and public opinion is on the whole fairly satisfied with the episcopal nomination which takes care to consult it. Those who are inclined to vote Ruridecanal action a failure because in many cases it has not retained the vitality with which it began, should consider whether they have exercised sufficient patience, or made sufficient allowance for untoward circumstances. The fact is that small local gatherings can never perpetuate themselves unless people see the use of them. Large gatherings reproduce themselves by the excitement and publicity attending them. These accompanying facts are seen to be themselves results. Something comes of them. Positive changes and improvements are seen to be produced by them. But small gatherings require some compensation for a want of excitement and publicity. This may be thought very weak, but it is human nature. The most perfect demonstrations of theoretical utility will fail to keep a system going unless people see and feel plainly that they are not giving time, labour, and money for nothing.

---

* So rapid is the growth of public opinion in this matter of self-government, that, even while these sheets are being printed, a cry for some voice in the selection of their pastors by parishes has proceeded from the public press. Evoked by the act of the Duke of St. Albans in granting permission to the parishioners of Redbourn to elect their own clergyman, subject to his approval, a general feeling has begun to show itself in opposition to a system which takes no account of the wishes of the people in a matter of most vital importance to them. It is easy to ridicule parochial elections, but impossible to defend an absolutely irresponsible system of patronage. As in most other cases, a compromise seems necessary in order to meet the claims of all parties, and it will have to be found. A still louder cry is at this moment being raised in the matter of Episcopal elections. Without a compromise on this point the Church cannot long hold together.

What is wanted, then, to make these units living, active, self-registering things, worthy of practical business-like Englishmen? Clearly the connection with some larger body, such as a Diocesan Synod or Conference, which they definitely and regularly influence through the principle inwoven into the very texture of English public life, Representation. This is the alembic which transmutes the base metal into gold. Let people only perceive that every Churchman who desires it may find a place in the Government of his Church, that his vote, his individual efforts, his personal influence may have an appreciable effect on the course of events, and the whole scene changes. The vestries are attended, the churchwardens and sidesmen are chosen for their qualities as representatives, the higher and more educated class of laymen comes to the front, Dissenters begin to join a body which has learnt to imitate the best part of their own system, their self-government, the indifferent world respects what respects itself, the Church's foes shrink back abashed, the poor are gathered in, education becomes a united and organized Church work, money flows in, schools and churches are built, a new order of things arises. Give such improvements time, and what must be the consequence? Is it too much to say that before long the State, which was looking on with doubtful eyes, questioning whether it should retain its connection with the Church, must wake up and find it is itself the Church? Might we not expect that the old times would return once more, and England, with her ecclesiastical differences composed, become the recognised head of the Reformed Churches, the predestined leader in the Evangelization of the world? To those who know what extraordinary results flow from the adoption of a correct system, and how impossible it is to move the most excellent machine unless a road is made for it, such ideas will not seem preposterous. The battle has been more than half fought when the army has been thoroughly organized under its proper officers, and the true vantage-ground has been seized.*

---

* The effect of the living, active, intimate union of parishes in a rural deanery (or collection of some twenty or thirty parishes) will not only tell on the Church by its action on the collective diocese, but it must necessarily have an immense effect on each individual parish. While we speak of the rural deanery as the unit of Church government, it is, of course, plain that the parish is the unit of Church work. The co-operation of clergy and laity in

It is impossible, then, to over-estimate the importance of the Diocesan Synods or Conferences, which are on the one hand to combine and vivify the Ruridecanal units, on the other to convey the sense of the whole Church to the final governing body; and here we advance to ground which is already becoming familiar to the public, a system of which we can point to portions already in existence. We also come at once to a practical issue on the great question of the connection of laymen with Church doctrine, to which, without entering into it, we have already referred.

We can hardly touch this subject without reference to that which does not come strictly under our notice in treating of the place of the Laity, viz., Convocation; but it was the Convocation of Canterbury which gave Diocesan Synods the chief impetus, and which has supplied the most important discussions on their introduction. Not that these discussions were prior in time to the treatment of the subject in Church Congresses, which Congresses have done no more excellent service than in giving it ventilation and encouragement. Paper after paper, discussion after discussion have familiarised the frequenters of Congresses with the merits of the whole question, on which indeed there has scarcely been, in those assemblies, a dissentient voice, so that it has become impossible to advance it any further by renewed discussion. It was different in Convocation, where, though the Reports of Committees of both Houses were eminently favourable, a certain amount of opposition developed itself. The lapse of years has, however, confirmed the views of their supporters, and the debate of this year (1869) in the Lower House terminated in the adoption of the following resolution, without its being put to a formal vote, by a large majority:—

"That in the opinion of this House it is desirable that a Diocesan Synod be annually held in the cathedral city of each diocese, or in some other town of the diocese which may be more

---

the parish, the organized, stated, business-like meetings for the good of the people in that parish, the distribution of work to each in the sphere for which he is fitted, giving, as it would, tenfold power to the clergyman, because no longer an autocratic power, and arousing, as it would, the noblest and truest life amongst his flock, would connect itself at once with the representation of the parish in the rural deanery, and thus go far to insure the election of the right men, not the mere agitators, nor fussy talkers, but the steady workers, whose "heart is in the right place," and whose education has fitted them for Church delegates.

convenient, to which the whole body of the clergy and of the churchwardens (being communicants) may be either personally or by representation invited; on which occasion the Synod may be occupied by consultation only, and not by the business usually transacted at visitations; they are further of opinion that to render such an assembly as useful as possible, the Bishop, if he see fit, should invite to the Synod any other laymen in his diocese whose attendance may by him be deemed desirable. They would contemplate the extension of the sessions of this Synod to as many days as may be required by the business before it."*

This resolution was the result of five years' deliberation, commenced in 1864, and extended, by means of Committees, over the intervening period. The noteworthy point is that the very essence of the resolution consists of the recommendation in favour of laymen forming a portion of the "Synod." Of course, all conclusions of the Lower House of Convocation would carry more weight if that House had been reformed (as we may hope it soon will be), so as to represent more accurately the clergy of the Province; but on a point of this kind it is more than probable that a Reformed Convocation would pronounce still more decidedly in the same sense.

To Canon Seymour belongs the honour of having led the van of this successful movement in the Lower House. In the final debate he was ably supported by Chancellor Massingberd, Archdeacon Denison, Mr. Joyce, and Dr. Fraser, the last two only supporting the introduction of laymen on condition of their not interfering with matters touching upon doctrine. Dr. Jebb and Archdeacon Hale alone spoke in opposition, but did not divide.†

In the Upper House the discussion of the year 1868 gathered chiefly round the experiences of the Bishop of Lichfield, whose successful Synods in New Zealand had induced him to take up with characteristic vigour the half-finished work of Bishop Lonsdale. The experience he had thus already had, in his new as well as his old diocese, had prepared him for the fire of cross-questions with which he was assailed; and, owing to the practical character thus given to the deliberations of the House,

---

* 'Guardian,' March 17, 1869.

† Ib., March 4, 1868.

and the responsible position filled by each of the Bishops, the debate was of rare interest. Bringing out, however, though it did, in the best possible way, nearly all that could be said on both sides of the question, no opposition to the Resolution was made; those who did not go along with the Bishops of Lichfield, Ely, Bangor, Gloucester and Bristol, and Rochester, confining themselves to the statement of reasons why they did not feel called upon to put the Resolution into practice themselves. That Resolution was to much the same effect as the one passed in 1869 in the Lower House, except that it expressly disparages mere clerical Diocesan Synods in favour of mixed Synods of clergy and laity.

Thus the Province of Canterbury, with which the Province of York has concurred, represented in its legal and constitutional assembly, has declared in favour of Diocesan Synods of clergy and laity. This fact, taken together with the uniform approval of the same by Church Congresses, and the very general, though not universal, advocacy of the Church press, must be taken to rule the point as far as the public opinion of the Church is concerned. The recommendation of the Committee of Bishops appointed by the Lambeth Conference was to the same effect as the above, and will carry weight with many. What, then, has been done, and why has not more been done?

In three dioceses, Bangor, Lichfield, and Ely, an organization has been already set on foot, which meets, or all but meets, the full requirements of the case. In six more at least, Gloucester and Bristol, Chester, Peterborough, York, Lincoln, and Rochester, announcements or proceedings, more or less public, have prepared us to expect a speedy movement in imitation of the three leaders, and some stirrings of organic life are visible in others. Lichfield and Ely have attracted much attention, and a brief outline of their proceedings may find a place here.

Both dioceses have adopted the principle of representation, and that of Lichfield a representation equally divided between clergy and laity. Both have included, in addition, all official clergy and the leading official laity of their diocese.* Both

---

* A difficulty is connected with the attendance of selected and *ex officio* members of a Synod in the presence of elected representatives. Perhaps, at first, when the object is to gather together every species of support for the movement, it is of no great consequence; but as the Synod or Confer-

have grounded themselves on a thoroughly organized system of ruridecanal action. Both have adopted the plan, necessary in dioceses overgrown like ours, of summoning Archidiaconal or County Conferences, in addition to the central one, for the purpose of a more complete representation of the whole Church. By this means every clergyman has the power of personal attendance. In both, the vote by Orders, including the separate veto of the Bishop, forms a leading feature, which is looked upon as the main protection from ill-considered acts. In both, the practical and administrative side of Church affairs has been accepted as the work of the Conferences, while that of Lichfield went so far, in 1868, as formally to exclude Doctrine and Ritual as subjects of the Conference. In both, the scheme has been very favourably received by both clergy and laity, and the vast majority of the Churchmen of the dioceses seem to be satisfied with the result. No difficulty has yet been experienced in finding work to do. Indeed the only difficulty seems to be how to get through the work in hand. This was particularly mentioned by Bishop Selwyn at the Stafford Conference lately held. It is certainly a proof of success that those who are summoned attend, and that harmony and good order have uniformly been preserved.

The proceedings of the Bangor Conferences seem to be less known, but they are said to have already done a considerable work in North Wales, though the Bishop of Bangor mentioned in the debate in Convocation of March 4, 1868, that he had hitherto failed in obtaining an "adequate representation of the laity." In addition to these instances of Conferences already at work in England and Wales, should be mentioned that of St. Andrew's in Scotland, where the first Conference of clergy and laity was held last year to consider "questions bearing on the social, moral, and religious welfare of the country," but which, according to the terms of the Report, was not to "detract from the authority, or in any way to interfere with the action of the

---

ence, unlike a promiscuous Church Congress, will be useless unless votes are taken, it is probable that, as time goes on, the attendance will have to be restricted to elected representatives. When the importance of the lay vote of a diocese is fully understood, the selection of particular persons, irrespective of election, will be opposed. And even as to the *ex officio* clergy of a diocese, whose claims stand on a higher ground, the question may arise, as it has in Ireland.

Diocesan Synod, which will still continue to be held as the Canons of the Church require." This Conference, organized on the same principles as those already noticed, was well attended by clergy and laity, and has been pronounced a decided success. The circumstances which have rendered the experiment, now being made in Ireland, one of such extreme interest to Churchmen, are too immediately present in the minds of all to admit of comment in this place. Watching, as we cannot but watch, with breathless interest, the convulsive throes of that much-suffering Church, we cannot deduce any argument from what is only at this moment taking shape, except, indeed, as to the need of settling some of these controverted points for ourselves while there is yet time. The mixed Conferences of the diocese of Down and Connor, which lasted for some years, preceded any of those held in this island.

After this brief survey of the state of the case as it actually stands in our own country, we may now, then, well inquire why so little has been done amongst us as yet to organize the laity for Church Government; why what seems to be the collective opinion of Churchmen has been so long overborne, or so tardily, and still in so few cases, complied with?

It is scarcely necessary to cover any space with arguments to show that in any such movement there must be an enormous *vis inertiæ* to overcome, a host of persons who think things are very well as they are, and who dread any vigorous organic movement. The greater part of any society consists of such persons. They only move when the active and forward have combined to drag them along. A very fortunate thing it is that there is such a drag on the wheel of progress. If it sometimes acts with too much obstructive force, it saves the coach from many a mishap; and as the journalistic power of this country has fallen, from various causes, very much out of the hands of earnest Churchmen, and into the hands of those who have their own reasons for not wishing well to the Church, this great motive power is not employed in the effort to move the mass. It is for the most part, though, happily, not entirely, on the other side. If any fault is to be found with the Church, ready pens are found in a thousand quarters. If any movement is set on foot for promoting its efficiency, cold water is thrown upon it. Witness the treatment, not only of Convocation, which might be accounted

for on other grounds, but of Church Congresses, where the general public find a place, laymen and women as well as clergy, of the attempts to increase the Episcopate, and of these very Diocesan Synods. Thus Churchmen have had to fall back on a mere ecclesiastical press, which only reaches the most active members even of their own body, and very slowly influences the masses of society.

It is more important to inquire into the obstructing causes existing amongst active and loyal Churchmen themselves. If these could be persuaded to dismiss prejudice and examine the subject afresh, the power of the *vis inertiæ*, and the hostility or indifference of the non-ecclesiastical press, would be of very little consequence.

The opposition of which we have to speak is more passive than active. It does not show itself so much in the press or at ecclesiastical gatherings as in the want of sympathy shown by those whose presence and countenance is requisite for the success of the movement. This is also reflected in the literary organs of the parties to which they belong; but we do not often find a plain, straightforward defence of such a policy in them. Their opposition is rather veiled under an indifference of the same kind as that shewn by the secular press, with which, in this matter, these organs too well agree.

For obvious reasons, it is undesirable to make sweeping charges against whole parties in the Church, which could not indeed be substantiated. Let us borrow the words of a bishop who is equally respected by all. "I am very anxious," said the Bishop of Ely, at his Diocesan Conference, held at Ely on July 8, 1868, "that this organization should not be partial or sectional in any way, but that it should be a move of the whole Church. I know there has been a feeling (I fear I must use names though I detest them, yet for convenience sake I cannot well avoid them), a feeling that the High Church are more in favour of organization, and that the Evangelical party (for which I cannot but on many points feel great sympathy) prefer individual spiritual work; but I am certain that a sectional organization will take place unless all parties work together." The "feeling" of which the bishop speaks is largely entertained. It is amongst the "Evangelical" school, the earnest and devoted men of that school, that indifference and want of sympathy with the move-

ment is said to be chiefly found, though there are, as every one knows, numerous exceptions. Few, however, have been so outspoken as Mr. Ryle, who not only takes a prominent place in his party, but who spoke in 1868 at the Dublin Congress, in a way which gives him a right to be heard. In the 'Christian Examiner' of December, 1868 (Dublin), Mr. Ryle writes an article on "Diocesan Synods in England," in which he sounds a note of warning to his friends in very plain terms.

He holds that, though right in themselves, these assemblies are not expedient. Their powers, he thinks, are exceedingly vague and indefinite. "They will, if elective, almost always exclude the Evangelical clergy," since these clergy are not numerous enough to obtain a place in representative bodies. Their "chief promoters are of the High Church party." "No English bishop will like to preside over a Church assembly in which a large and important section of his clergy has no place at all." What the course of the "Evangelical clergy" should be under these circumstances he will not decide; but he is at a loss to see what good synodical action can do till disestablishment comes, if it does come. He is "quite sure that he does see in Diocesan Synods a most fertile source of strife, heartburning, bitterness, party-spirit, contention, and division." And he concludes by hoping that the Evangelical clergy, whatever they may do, "will act together and adopt one line of conduct."

One can hardly think that the "line of conduct" of absenting themselves from Diocesan Synods or Conferences will be followed by Mr. Ryle's brethren,—certainly one may be permitted to hope that it will not; and as to the past, there is reason to believe that the "Evangelical clergy" who stayed away from the Lichfield and Ely Conferences were far from numerous. There is nothing to prove that they would be at a disadvantage anywhere. They may have been slower in attending Church Congresses than others, but they have held an important place even there. If in some cases they have been in an apparent minority, it has been ascribed by those who have considered the matter rather to the zeal of the new and forward party of extreme High Churchmen, who, with the eagerness of neophytes, previously agreed to be present in great numbers, and to the apathy of Low Churchmen, who did not take the trouble of putting in an appearance even when close at hand, rather

than to any natural and normal deficiency of numbers and influence amongst the latter.

But do not these statements of Mr. Ryle's sound like a strange confession that there is no place for his opinions in a free and general assembly of clergy and Church laity? He would surely not admit that his views were not those of the Church of England; on the contrary, he affirms that they are. And whether one party is in a minority or another, is it not plain that there have always been, and must always be, more parties than one, strictly within the limits of the Church? Are people never to meet unless they are agreed? The very object of meetings is to brighten up one another, to learn how much there is to be said on both sides of questions, and thus to get rid of unfounded prejudices. If, indeed, the moderate High Churchmen and the moderate Low Churchmen were so opposed that they could not meet upon any basis of agreement, Mr. Ryle's argument would be more intelligible; but let any one read his speech at Dublin above mentioned, and he will see that there is scarcely a word in it, much less a sentiment, which might not have fallen from what is called a High Churchman. Not indeed from those whose notion of loyalty to the Church of England is to heap abuse upon the Reformation, who pride themselves on holding almost all the peculiar doctrines of Rome whilst retaining office amongst ourselves, and who claim to interpret our Articles and Formularies in a "non-natural" sense. This is an insignificant section of the Church, and no one knows better than Mr. Ryle that the true way of shaming it out of its extravagances is to let it display itself in grave, representative meetings, in the midst of those whose learning and character make their very presence a sufficient refutation.

And surely Mr. Ryle is too acute a man not to perceive what a contradiction there is between the claim so often made by his school for the inclusion of the laity in Church affairs, and the objection raised against an organization which is to give that laity a most important place in those affairs. It is by no means improbable, in the existing condition of England as regards religion, that the representative laity would more generally sympathize with the Low Church clergy than with the High. Mr. Ryle would seem to deprive them of their natural leaders, their own clergy.

Nor in a general point of view can any but the narrowest of partisans contemplate without the greatest alarm the self-exclusion of the "Evangelical clergy" (which would in the end be followed by that of the "Evangelical" laity), from assemblies of Churchmen; for such a policy must issue in their speedy extinction as Churchmen. A party or a section which, when the whole mass is summoned to form representative unions under properly constituted authorities, recognised by themselves, allows itself to drop out of the system, must either secede and form a dissenting body of its own, or it must dwindle into insignificance. The Church of England cannot afford to lose those who, in the last generation and the one before, infused life into her dry bones, and whose influences are as much required as ever. In the Church revival of this generation there is just the same danger of a relapse into formalism and a mere fashionable religion as in days gone by. The Caroline Church was earnest enough, having been tried in the fires of persecution; yet it merged into the Hanoverian. So it may be again. The "Low Church" school has made certain things peculiarly its own, and for the most part, while High Churchmen have learnt much from them, retains those things as its own. The profound reverence for the Bible, the zeal for the "conversion" of souls, the exclusion of week-day habits from the observance of Sunday, the Sunday-school,—these are often sneered at, by those who should know better, as "Puritanical," and no doubt they often have been, and are connected with the faults which are summed up to Englishmen under that title; but they are in fact among the best characteristics of a faithful ministry, and it would be a terrible thing for the land if they dwindled away and disappeared within our Church. It is generally thought that there was a deeper and more large-hearted piety in the old "Evangelicals" than the new; but it is an easy thing to see what is hollow and what shocks good taste in a high profession, and very easy to brand all with the faults of a few. The thing remains.

If, indeed, a dread of being in a minority has produced amongst "Low Churchmen" this dislike to common action in Church Assemblies with their brethren of the clergy and laity, and has taken such root that it can only be met by a plan which should give a representation to minorities, as has been proposed in certain Irish dioceses, it would be highly desirable

that some such plan should be entertained; but they must remember that this cuts both ways, and, taking England as a whole, there can be little doubt that they would be far more likely to find a satisfactory place in the usual straightforward way of direct representation.

It is enough to have indicated the nature of this difficulty, and to express a belief as well as a hope that it will be overcome. Founded, if one may venture to say so, in temporary accidents, there seems to be nothing real in it, nothing which Christian temper, tact and forbearance will not dissipate. There is, perhaps, a greater difficulty in the differences of opinion existing within the "party of organization" itself, the great mass of High Churchmen, as to the functions of the laity in Church government. It is sufficiently notorious that very many High Churchmen are exceedingly jealous of the present movement for uniting the two portions of the Church, the clergy and the laity, in any common action. The fear lest the free action of the bishops and clergy should be hampered in any degree by such co-operation is the ruling idea in their minds. Nor must this be put down to mere prejudice or caste feeling, though, no doubt, it receives its colouring in some degree from such causes, causes which have always existed and must in the nature of the case exist, and that not only in the Church, but among all bodies of Christians. Its real root, or at any rate all that we need seriously consider, lies in the conscientious belief that the Laity have no right to interfere, directly or indirectly, in the decision of spiritual matters, great or small. Fearing lest any co-operation in synodical action, even though questions of doctrine and discipline were reserved for the clergy alone, might gradually lead to what they consider to be an unscriptural and unecclesiastical method of Church government, the holders of this view very generally oppose the admission into Church government of the "lay-element" in any form. They say that the Crown and Parliament, the constituted representatives of the Laity in Church government, sufficiently hamper us already. Circumstances have forced us to give them a great deal too much power as it is; how absurd then to make fresh yokes for our necks! It will be quite time enough to deal with fresh encumbrances when the Disestablishment of the Church takes place,—as for the most part these men hope it soon may.

Many who do not go so far as this, and who perceive the need of some organization of the Laity before the great change which they expect arrives, are willing to allow the Laity a place in Diocesan Conferences, but on the one stringent condition that they abjure all interference with doctrine, or matters touching upon doctrine. The Diocesan Clerical Synod must be retained pure and simple; the mixed Conference must be wholly distinct and subordinate. It may employ itself on the "temporal accidents of spiritual things," but on these alone. Their text is the sentence recently uttered, in a crowded meeting of clergy and laity, by an estimable young clergyman who has drunk deep at the wells of ultra-sacerdotalism,—"It is one of the noblest prerogatives of the laity to follow and obey." This sentiment was greatly applauded at the said meeting. Perhaps it puts the view of which we speak in a somewhat extreme form, but it is more honest to speak out, and it comes to this in the end.

Now if this were the universal creed of even very High Churchmen, matters would look most unpromising, but, happily it is not so. As we shall find that great authorities differ on this point, we may at least hope that opposition to full lay representation in Synods or Conferences will not bind together any large bodies of men. We have seen that the Convocation of Canterbury has pronounced on the subject. Let us glance at the grounds of the arguments which prevailed so as to produce an *unopposed* vote in an assembly of *clergy* which is reckoned, with truth, as having a decidedly High Church complexion.

Let us take Chancellor Massingberd's speech as a specimen. He seconded Canon Seymour's motion in these words:—"It seems to me that we are right in embracing in the proposal to revive Diocesan Synods the introduction of the laity as well as the clergy into those assemblies. . . . My doubts have been as to the propriety of introducing them into Synods, lest we should thereby deprive the gatherings themselves of the character of Diocesan Synods. But I have now come to think that there are ways in which this question may be regarded, by which we can avoid the possibility of any such danger as that which some apprehend; for, whatever may be our opinions respecting the power or authority or privilege of the lay members of the Church

in regard to the exercise of a defining voice in the Synod, there can be no doubt as to the power and right of the Bishop to ask their opinion upon all those grave matters which a Diocesan Synod would be likely to consider. And if he has the right thus to ask their opinion, surely also he has the privilege of deciding for himself as to the opinions they may express.* Neither can I entertain the smallest doubt as to the immense importance to be derived from having the concurrence of the laity. . . . The immense advantage of these assemblies would be seen especially with regard to the means we should have of carrying out matters within our own body without resorting to new laws or to trials at law. A great many of our present difficulties might be resolved or greatly mitigated. I cannot but suppose that if men had but the opportunity of propounding their opinions, or could be heard by their Bishop in the presence of his assembled clergy and a select laity of his diocese—if they could there express what they may consider their grievances, and put forth their claims, and hear on the other hand the opinions of others holding different views, persons, it may be, of more age and experience than themselves,—and, after all, see the conclusion at which the Bishop, with the concurrence of the great majority present, arrived, the moral effect would be so great that the minds of doubters would be satisfied, and they would be brought to agree with what they would otherwise have opposed if it had seemed to them that the Bishop sitting *in camerâ* had propounded opinions and maxims which, however much they might be according to law, or the Bishop's view of the law, might seem to be laid down as if they were only his own conclusions on which they were precluded from forming a judgment. It would be impossible to overrate the value of Diocesan Synods, if only in one single diocese they were the cause of saving us from the sad dilemmas and interminable discussions to which we are liable." †

---

* In other words, the "assent" which all Christian antiquity required of the lay people involves "dissent." You cannot call a body of men together to listen. They must discuss and vote, and their vote must have its due weight with the Bishop, the clergy, and the public.

† Report of Convocation in 'Guardian,' March 17, 1869. So also writes Canon Richard Seymour in the preface to his pamphlet on 'Diocesan Synods' (Rivingtons, 1868):—

"Such a diocesan organization (of clergy and laity) would, in times of sharp controversy, whether on matters of doctrine or ceremonial, supply the safest and healthiest means for their settlement."

Now any one who knows Chancellor Massingberd's works must be aware that he is a pronounced High Churchman,—of the Anglican and not the Romanising school, to be sure, but still a High Churchman, and the last man who would relinquish an iota of the rights and duties of the Bishops and Clergy.

The opinions of Archdeacon Churton and many other High Churchmen of reputation might be quoted to the same effect; but perhaps a few extracts from Dr. Moberly's 'Bampton Lectures' (Parker, 1868), as they go to the very root of the subject, may fitly close these extracts. The new Bishop of Salisbury has been long enough before the world to command a respect for his opinions from very many besides High Churchmen, but they at least will respect them. The object of his Lectures is to show that, in the language of Scripture, it is the Church entire and complete, not any class, or rank, or caste of persons within it, which is spoken of as the "Spirit-bearing body, the successor of Christ, the holder of power and privilege in Christ,—nay, even as Christ Himself upon the earth" (p. 49). This "whole body must, in some manner and degree that should be real, however small, have a certain amount of power to act," must contribute its sanction and therefore "its possible refusal to sanction." The spiritual officers of this Church, holding by direct descent from the apostles the gift of the Holy Spirit, are yet representatives of the whole body (p. 52). The usurpation of autocratic power by these representatives may produce, as it has produced, revolution and disunion (p. 56). "But the Church has within it the secret of restoration. There is assuredly reserved to the Church at large, at least in its primitive constitution, authority to remonstrate and to overrule tyrannical pretensions on the part of those who hold the official powers, as the holders of these official powers have also the right in their respective places and degrees to rebuke and repress the extravagances of individual fancy, or of congregational caprice and self-will" (p. 57). If either of these essential principles is forgotten, extreme evil cannot fail to be the consequence. We either have, on the one hand, a choice between Congregationalism, or, what is the same in principle, a real tyranny based on a factitious universal suffrage (the position of Rome); on the other, "if the holders of such (spiritual) offices were to be regarded merely as descendants and inheritors of powers originally confined to

twelve men, and subsequently handed down from them by direct and exclusive succession to themselves, I do not see how they could be regarded otherwise as a body, than a separate, irresponsible, supreme company, as compared with the mass of lay Christians. They would be not indeed by blood, but by clear separation and difference, a caste in the Church, in whom would absolutely reside all the power, all the knowledge, all the prerogatives of authority of all kinds; while the large mass of men and women who constituted the immense numerical majority in the Church would have no duty but to listen, submit, and obey—no voice in counsel, no share in power, no right of judging, criticizing, or objecting. In short, on this theory, the clergy would be the real Church, and the lay-people simply dumb recipients of whatever the clerisy—that is the Church—chose to lay upon them." But the true view is that while the clergy are, "for public purposes, the organs of the body's life, the great life itself, the great deposit of the spiritual life, remains in the body at large. There is the true inheritor of Christ, containing in itself the real principle of absolute conquest and mastery over the whole world" (p. 60). In his third Lecture he shows how this principle relieves us of all difficulty as to the question of the inspiration of Scripture. The whole Spirit-bearing body received it as God's word at the time when alone its pretensions could be judged. St. Paul speaks of "the gospel which *ye have received*." In his fourth Lecture he shows how this principle was recognised in the transactions of the primitive Church. The apostles and elders "with the whole Church" send the Decree of the Apostolic Council. Tertullian's language "strongly confirms the idea that he would not have regarded the lay voice as altogether powerless in matters of Christian counsel and joint decree." St. Cyprian resolved to "do nothing without the counsel of the clergy and the consent of the lay people." Lay people were present at the Councils of Eliberis (A.D. 305) and Toledo (A.D. 398) as well as at the comparatively modern Councils of Pisa and Constance.

In thus touching the relation of the laity to the clergy in past ages, it is interesting to observe how different a view may be given of the same events by two equally honest and competent students: the greater part of Dr. Pusey's book on 'The Councils of the Church' being devoted to the proof of the nonentity of the

laity in Christian assemblies from the earliest times. Dr. Moberly, on the contrary, sums the question up by saying that "their influence on the counsels and decisions of the Church was neither small nor insignificant. They had an unquestioned voice in the selection of the bishops, and, even, as there is reason to suppose, of the presbyters; so that even those who sat in council were the men whom they had concurred in choosing. They were present, often, if not always, in the same sort of position as the ordained deacons at the consultations and debates of Councils." "I am at a loss to discover the beginning of the doctrine that the truth was in such sort delivered to the bishops as that they alone (or even along with the presbyters) have the absolute and final right to consult or judge respecting it" (p. 124).

It will be easily gathered from the tone of these extracts, that while, on the one hand, the writers and speakers make no reservation as to doctrine or discipline, in urging the admission of the laity to Synods, they have not the slightest intention of interfering with the ancient prerogative of the bishop and clergy. In order to reduce this idea to practice, the method usually adopted is exactly suitable, viz., the voting by Orders. The Bishop, the Clergy, and the Laity, must each have a veto. Though meeting in common for discussion, a majority of Clergy and Laity, if voting by Orders is demanded, must be held necessary to pass any measure; and even then the Bishop may throw it all out, if he pleases; and this plan is found to work perfectly well in practice, as well as to be sound in theory.*

One other point is, however, important to notice in reference to this question. What do we mean by questions of doctrine? Some people speak as if our Church were open to begin afresh,

---

* The question of a test for electors of lay delegates has been generally decided in the negative, the traditional and legal position of all members of the Church in England having made it very difficult to resort to what is theoretically desirable. The only possible stipulation seems to be that the electors must be *bonâ fide* members of the Church. That the delegates must themselves be Communicants seems to be generally admitted and acted on in practice. Unused as our people are to Church organization, and difficult to move, for the reasons previously stated, too great stiffness and exactness seems to be undesirable at first. The success of the Ely Archidiaconal Conferences, the whole four of which were attended by 1600 persons, in the aggregate, last year, has been due to their very looseness and liberal arrangements, which disarmed all opposition; so that, in the words of the Archdeacon of Ely, "all parties were united, almost without exception." The Archdeacon's Paper on 'Diocesan Organization,' read at the Liverpool Church Congress, 1869, will repay perusal.

in each of her parishes and dioceses, the task of settling or defining abstract doctrine. Such a notion is simply preposterous. Of course it is in the power of the whole Church, or the whole of the members of the same communion, to reconsider Articles or Liturgies; but this can only be done by general or quasi-general Councils, or an episcopal tribunal appointed by such Council. The Lambeth Conference was but the commencement of such Councils for the Anglican Communion, and the affirmation of the Faith there made has a considerable importance in the troubled times we are now passing through. But Diocesan or Provincial, or even Insular Synods, can do nothing of the kind; and, as to law, the Ecclesiastical Courts take up the law of all matters relating to discipline.[*] There will be matters of minor importance, more or less, no doubt, connected with doctrine, which would fall under the cognisance of the mixed Diocesan Synods or Conferences just noticed, and the principles laid down by the authorities quoted above may well carry us over that supposed difficulty. If, however, it still remains in the minds of any considerable body of men, arrangements may be made for separate meetings of the bishop and clergy in connection with the mixed Conference. This plan, we have seen, has been adopted already in some cases. The question is, whether, on the principles maintained in this paper, such separate meeting is a necessity; and, if not, whether the extra time and trouble required, the jealousies inseparable from such a plan, and the absolute certainty that the laity will fail to take the same interest in Church affairs if any diocesan matter is excluded from their consideration when summoned, will not bring the whole thing to a dead-lock. Will not the laity cease to attend these Diocesan Conferences, and thus break up the organization which seems to be so necessary? All this offers material for the very gravest consideration. At a great crisis of the English Church, to hamper the only means (humanly speaking) of escape with unnecessary restrictions, carrying with them the certain seeds of eventual failure, does not seem to exhibit that practical wisdom for which Englishmen are celebrated.

---

[*] This applies to Incumbents only. Curates are still subject to the primitive rule, which admitted of no appeal beyond the Archbishop of the Province. That these Courts are not satisfactory is another matter. They will not become so except under the joint action of Diocesan and Provincial Synods.

It only remains to notice that class of objectors who are influenced by none of the above considerations, but who discourage these Conferences or Synods because they believe that they will find nothing to do, and so die of inanition. It is very difficult to deal with human prophecy. Perhaps if a course of action is only proved to be much desired by competent judges, and to have many positive advantages attending it, the right course is to give it a fair trial. But *if everything depends* on adopting this plan, if, as we have asserted, the machinery of Church government is in such a state that without the organized intervention of the Church Laity the worst disasters are imminent; if, whether we are Church-and-State men, or Separationists, we arrive at the same conclusion; then it becomes the duty of Churchmen to meet and consult as to what they can best do, in order that they may bring the matter to a speedy issue. In every diocese it is only the voice of a well-informed and audibly-pronounced public opinion which is required; all parties concerned will be willing enough to act, if such a public opinion is sufficiently expressed.

But in reality this notion of Diocesan Synods or Conferences not finding enough to do to keep them going, arises very often from an imperfect estimate of what there is to do. We have acquiesced in too low a standard, and cannot lift our eyes to a higher level; or we happen to possess an organization of certain episcopally-appointed officers, and we imagine we have attained the same result as if every person in the diocese had a voice through his proper representatives; forgetting that people are willing enough to let things go their way when they see all responsibility taken off their own shoulders, and merely oppose the dead weight of a *vis inertiæ* to any plans, in which they have had no hand, for changing the face of a sluggish diocese. Let every one feel he has a share in the government, and the change is magical. We are then, in fact, going back to what we call in politics "Constitutional principles."

Take simply the question of Education. Mr. Pound believes, and he gives good grounds for his belief, that whereas "the Church schools now contain no more than half the children in a diocese, after the action of Synods (in the matter of education), by the end of the first or second year, these schools would con-

tain four-fifths."* So with the raising of funds for churches, school-buildings, parsonages, additional curates, Theological Colleges, and other Diocesan purposes, which is, generally speaking, a miserable failure if one thinks what the wealth of a diocese is; let every one touch and handle the organized whole, and a sure, if not speedy, change will be observed. Confidence takes the place of suspicion: duty comes home to every man's own conscience.

So with the recommendations of a Bishop's Charge. As Chancellor Massingberd said in Convocation,† "We know how constantly it happens that our Bishops put forth in their Charges admirable and excellent recommendations; again and again they return to the same subject in subsequent Charges, and express their wonder that what had been so often recommended was not done. The greater portion of the laity do not read the Bishops' Charges, and do not perhaps attribute so much importance to them as they ought." A very different view would be taken of a Bishop's words if it was felt that they touched matters with which each man was individually concerned. "These Diocesan Synods would thus greatly increase the power of the Bishop in the best possible way." ‡

So with the assistance of the Laity in parochial work. How little has yet been done, though Convocation has long ago reported most strongly in favour of Lay Readers! Scarcely any one knows that it has so reported. The number of those who read the debates in Convocation is infinitesimally small. Besides, who does not see the difference between mere lay associations working independently, the zeal and energy of good men expending itself in every conceivable and anarchical way, and the efforts of such men organized under rules laid down by themselves in Diocesan Assemblies along with the Bishop and the clergy? People will not be driven now-a-days. They require to be led, and to have a hand in the government which affects themselves and others.

But if these illustrations—the merest skeleton specimens of what Synods would find to do—fail to carry weight, let us only consider fully the aspect of the case as presented in Convocation

---

* 'Remarks upon the Best Mode of Carrying out a National Education.' By Rev. W. Pound (Rivingtons, 1868). P. 30.

† Report of Convocation, in 'Guardian,' March 17, 1869.

‡ Ibid.

by such a man as Dr. Kay.* "So long," said he, "as Churchmen could be brought together, he felt sure that great good would follow. Englishmen had a strong inclination to look on 'every man's house as his castle;' and English clergymen (if he might say so) had got to look on their parishes too much as independent units. Anything, from Ruridecanal meeting up to Diocesan Synod, which helped to do away with this appeared so much clear gain." Or hear the Bishop of Lichfield, who has certainly some right to speak on this subject, declaring that "he has no more doubt that they (Diocesan Synods or Conferences) are necessary than he doubts whether bread and meat are good for food." It is quite true that the Laity in England have no such important work in respect of Church Sustentation as in New Zealand, or other "disestablished" Church communities; but it may be questioned if the anomalies of our Establishment do not require their organized action even more than it is required elsewhere; and at any rate, if disunion and division are dreaded, it is worth observing that the late Bishop of New Zealand is able to report that "since we began our synodical system in 1859, (since which time four General Synods and more than fifty Diocesan Synods have been held in New Zealand), the action of the Laity has been such as to commend the system to the approbation of the whole community. The rapid growth of Church feeling among the Laity has been one of the most remarkable fruits of the cordial welcome with which they were received by the Clergy." Precisely such a "growth of Church feeling" is at present required with exceeding urgency among the English Laity. It is reasonable to suppose that the same "growth," the same harmony, the same "approbation of the whole community," would attend the adoption of the same method which has produced these results abroad.

If the principle is true that laws must be based on general consent, it is high time that the voices of those who are affected by Church legislation should be heard. If the principle is true that those who suffer from abuses should at least have the power of exposing them as a preliminary to their removal by legislation, then those of the Laity who are still left, who have not left the Church, as so many have, on the ground that they

---

* Report of Convocation, in 'Guardian,' March 17, 1869.

conceived, rightly or wrongly, that they had no power to remedy abuses, should be called together to state their grievances. How many millions of souls have been lost to the Church for want of this opportunity it is impossible to calculate, but every one has materials for forming an opinion upon it. The English Reformation has left, in a very authoritative document, the *Reformatio Legum*, a record of its intentions with regard to the introduction of the "lay-element," and that in days when the Supremacy was a personal embodiment, so that no one can suppose it to be contrary to the principles of Church and State, as understood at that time. The whole theory of the Reformation was to set the laity free. It never intended to exclude them from the direct management of Church affairs. The remarkable series of so-called accidents by which the true freedom of the Church has been hampered by Crown and Parliament, while the laity have fallen out of their due, primitive, Apostolic place, is a matter for historical inquiry rather than for an Essay. It is not the part of those who really wish well to the Establishment to refuse to embrace such re-adjustments of the relations of Church and State as may gradually, though ever so indirectly, remove obstructions which neither statesmen nor ecclesiastics contemplated when those relations were revised at the Reformation.

Perhaps this very remark may, however, strike the key-note of a difficulty which indistinctly haunts the minds of those who are for "letting well" (as they call it) "alone." Will not this diocesan action of the Laity interfere in some way with the Constitutional position of Parliament and the functions of Convocation as they stand now? It is perhaps enough to say that if the thing is necessary we need not trouble ourselves about future consequences; but, in fact, there is nothing of the sort imagined necessarily contained in the proposition. On the contrary, it may well be held that some organic change in the central government of the Church, of a rude and rending kind, is much more likely to be made if this diocesan self-government is not conceded than if it is. It would be wholly premature to give any prominent place in this Essay to the question of the desirableness of extending the action of representative Laity still further, so as to assume the form of a central Council or consultative body for the whole Church of this island. Some

like Mr. Bandinel, have gone so far as to press with the utmost cogency for an immediate and "Organic Reform of Convocation" in the sense of "a full and free representation of the Communicant Laity of England" sitting along with the reformed and enlarged Convocation of the Clergy, Canterbury and York being united.* This he claims for the Laity on the ground of their Scriptural right and Constitutional position, rightly understood. The body thus formed, clergy and laity deliberating together, but voting separately, and measures being only sent up for the Queen's assent when voted by a majority of the three orders, Bishops, Clergy, and Laity, he would place, as to Church matters, in the position of the existing Legislature, except so far as questions of property were concerned. This seems to involve, though the author will not admit it, the virtual and immediate separation of Church and State.

Others, like Mr. F. H. Dickinson, in a pamphlet published in 1857,† would form a new Assembly, side by side with, and independent of, the existing Convocations,—a National meeting or Synod, representing accurately the clergy and laity of England, which he admits would in time supersede the present Provincial Convocations. He suggests "some central place of meeting, perhaps Oxford," and believes that Parliament would work with such an Assembly as far as it addressed itself to practical matters.

Others, like Chancellor Massingberd,‡ think that "each House of Parliament might be invited formally by the President of either Convocation to appoint a 'committee on ecclesiastical affairs' which should be at liberty to sit in the Lower House of Convocation of the Province to which they belonged, and to deliver opinions, but not to vote;" a plan which, he states, would be in accordance with the ancient practice of admitting civilians, nominated by the Crown, to Convocation. Men's minds will of course be turned in this direction. One of our English Bishops even, in a letter to the writer of this paper, says that "he does not see why a Lay Representative Body

---

* 'Organic Reform of Convocation.' An Essay, by the Rev. T. Bandinel. Second edition. (Parker, 1869.)

† 'Convocation and the Laity.' A Letter, &c., by Francis Henry Dickinson, Esq. (Ridgway, 1857.)

‡ 'A Real Diocesan Synod, &c.' A Letter, &c., by F. C. Massingberd, M.A., Chancellor of Lincoln. (Longmans, 1868.)

should not be formed for each of the Provinces of Canterbury and York, in the same way as in the dioceses of Lichfield and Ely; not to supersede the functions of Parliament, but to prepare measures to be submitted to Parliament,—so long as the Church remains Established."

But the point to which attention is now directed is the assertion of the Place of the Laity in Church Government as regards Dioceses, the principles on which such a place is claimed for them, and the practical reasons why their admission to that place must be no longer delayed. Once organize the Dioceses, and there will be abundance of "wisdom and counsel" called forth which will discuss the ulterior question, and take it out of the hands of individual proposers. All such propositions as the above have their value; they teach men to think upon the subject. But a great deal has to be done before we are ripe for any central organization. An immature scheme, forced into a sort of galvanic action, would be worse than useless. It may very probably be found that no scheme at all is required, for the real object of these Synods is to draw forth the "mind of the Church,"—of the whole Church, Clergy and Laity. The public press will give voice to their decision, and politicians will no longer be at liberty to treat that decision with indifference. The men whose statesmanlike grasp of mind has to be brought to bear on such future questions have yet to be trained in Diocesan Synods or Conferences; and for those we are ripe, perhaps over-ripe.

The whole future of the Church of England depends, humanly speaking, on the use which will be made of the next year or two. There is yet time, if Churchmen exert themselves, to show such a front as will more than resist the attacks about to be made upon them. The necessary course has been, it is hoped, sufficiently indicated in the preceding pages. But there is no time to lose.

Montagu Burrows.

Nov. 4th, 1869.

ESSAY V.

PRIVATE LIFE AND MINISTRATIONS OF THE PARISH PRIEST.

By WILLIAM WALSHAM HOW, M.A.,
Rector of Whittington, Shropshire; Hon. Canon of S. Asaph.

CONTENTS OF ESSAY V.

Personal Holiness.—Secularity of English Clergy.—Devotional Habits.—Retreats.—Tone in Society.—Gravity. Courage. Travelling. Attitude towards Opponents. Sports.—Pursuits.—Secular Employments.—Study.—Thoroughness in Pastoral Work.—Indolence.—Pastoral Visiting.—The School.—Confession.—Preparation for Confirmation.—After-work with Confirmed.—Guilds.—Mission Churches and Cottage Lectures.—Conclusion.

PRIVATE LIFE AND MINISTRATIONS OF THE PARISH PRIEST.

THE Parish Priest needs in his private life HOLINESS; in his private ministrations THOROUGHNESS. Other things must be spoken of, but these are chief.

Holiness of living is at the root of the whole matter. Without this a man may be indefatigably energetic, an admirable organizer, an eloquent preacher, a learned divine, a benevolent almoner; he may boast of the Apostolicity of his orders, and magnify his priestly powers and authority; but he will do little in the great work of leading souls to Christ and to heaven. "More sinners are converted by holy than by learned men," says Bishop Wilson. There is a marvellous power in one whose life is manifestly "hid with Christ in God." A holy life is not sanctimonious, not peculiar, not demonstrative. It is very simple and natural, and very transparent, except that the outside, pure and calm and beautiful as it is, cannot adequately reflect the light within. Such a life in any one has great power. It is a potent magnet. But in the Parish Priest how absolutely is it necessary. Who will believe him who says, "This is the way; walk ye in it," when he himself is seen to turn into another path? Who will take for his guide to the Alpine summit one who is manifestly unfamiliar with the route, and who can tell him from hearsay only of its perils and its joys, its labours and its glories? No words upon this subject could be better than those of the good Bishop Armstrong, in his 'Pastor in the Closet': "I am set as an example to the flock. O Christ, what a work of personal holiness must I seek to fulfil in myself through the power of the Holy Ghost! Of all the souls committed to me, of all this multitude of souls, mine should be the most pure, unworldly, unselfish, mortified, gentle, spiritual. Even so; I must preach Thee through my

own life, and be myself a sermon unto my flock. My flock should feel that I am not a man of this world. While I invite them to heaven, I should be seen walking heavenward myself; I should have experience of the way; I should be nearer Thee than any; not behind any, but before all; a pattern of true devotion, godly ardour, unworldliness, charity in speech and action. If I am a lover of pleasure, or a seeker of greatness, or greedy of filthy lucre, or ambitious and fond of advancement, or self-indulgent, or careless, I must needs most grievously offend my flock. For personal holiness, for personal holiness I do pray, Lord Jesus." It is said of the faithful pastor, by the Good Shepherd Himself, "He goeth before them." Let every Parish Priest have these words written up as a motto in his room. They should be the principle of his life.

In our branch of the Church the clergy are more secular in character, more mixed up with secular life, more socially intermingled with the world around them than in any other branch. We do not complain of this. It has its manifest advantages. But then it has its manifest dangers. And one of the most obvious of these is the danger of the clergy accepting in their daily life the level of the social world in which they live, and not rising to a higher standard of spirituality. With much enforcement of high and holy things, with much propriety of living, with much careful performance of all official duties, nay, with much zeal and life and energy in these, the clergyman is still very often lacking in that distinct tone and character which alone will make his people look up to him as a true guide heavenward, inasmuch as he is felt to be on the heavenward road—yes, and, as he should be, *before them,* on the heavenward road—himself. "He goeth before them." The clergyman ought to be felt to be a holy man, a man of prayer, a man of a heavenly mind, a man who loves Christ, and who strives to copy Christ. God forbid he should be a hypocrite, and should seem to be this without being it. When we say he should be felt to be all this, we mean he should *be* this, so truly, so honestly, so thoroughly, that no man should be able to say of him, "This man, who is set to guide us, is no nearer heaven than ourselves." The light of God's Spirit in him should shine through the outer framework of his life, and give light to the whole house. He has, in the self-oblation of his Ordination vows, broken the

alabaster box of very precious ointment on his Saviour's Feet, and the house should be filled with the odour of the ointment. How else shall souls cast down with the sense of their own coldness and deadness and backwardness come to him to be lifted up out of their despair? How else shall tender spirits, miserable through their lack of devotion, fainting for the lifeless dryness of their spiritual acts, come to him to be taught how to pray? How else shall the mourner in the dark hour of sorrow come to him for comfort and heavenly hope? There are numbers of such everywhere—numbers of souls longing, aye, passionately longing, for some words which may help them. Yet they seldom think of coming to those who ought to be the ones to speak such words. They bury their longings in their own breasts, and speak not, and then after a little time the longings pass away. Why is this? Is it not too often because they do not feel the clergy to be more spiritually-minded than others, because they perceive them to be in their lives and conversation (setting aside their official acts and words) very like the rest of men? Then, on the other side, see what numbers do flock to any very holy man for help and counsel. In our time this yearning shows itself chiefly in connection with the practice of confession. Of this we shall have to speak farther on. At present we are only insisting upon the existence of this yearning for help, and upon the fact that those who do yearn for it will not turn for help to any whom they do not feel to be really holy men. This yearning is instinctive, and no mark of party. We cannot forget how young men in Cambridge used to open their whole hearts, with all their troubles and all their temptations, to Charles Simeon.

We have said that holiness of living is at the root of the whole matter. But there is something at the root of holiness of living. We may go deeper down still. The surest way to gain a higher stage of spiritual life is by an increase in habits of devotion. "He that has learned to pray aright," says Bishop Wilson, "has got the secret of a holy life." Longer prayers, more fervent prayers, more frequent prayers, the habit of secret ejaculatory prayer many times in the day, greater particularity of intercession, the use of manuals of prayer, the conquest of indolence, sleepiness, wandering of mind in prayer, all these will be aimed at by him who longs after holiness of

living.* It is not forgotten how differently men are constituted, and how much more difficult devotional habits are to some than to others. This makes it difficult to lay down rules. Yet it seems desirable not to omit to mention the extreme importance of securing at least some regular time for devotion in the early morning, while the mind is in its calmest and least distracted state. A very simple rule has been given, and may help some, though many will think it scanty in requirement. Let the Parish Priest always secure forty minutes in the early morning, twenty for devotional reading (which must never be chosen with a view to his other work) and twenty for prayer. Devotional habits will mark and influence everything else. They bring down a sure and direct blessing from above. All work will be the better and truer for their acquirement. Great activity is very common without devotion. Devotion without activity of work is very rare. The true aim of the Parish Priest should be to combine the two, to sanctify and elevate his daily labours by his secret devotions, to embody and enshrine his secret devotions in his daily labours; "neither diminishing," as St. Gregory says, "his care for internal things through the occupation of external, nor neglecting his interest in external things through anxiety for internal." It is Angels' life, this blessed interblending of acts of devotion with acts of loving ministration. Who could behold an Angel without feeling that he had come straight from the presence of God, with all the radiance of the heavenly worship still streaming around him? In his degree it should be so with the Parish Priest.

> "Angel He calls you; be your strife
> To lead on earth an Angel's life."

As the servant of God comes down from the Mount—from the presence of the All-holy One—bearing His Law in his hands to teach it to His people, let them see on his countenance the shining of the heavenly glory; let them feel that the grace and love and meekness and earnestness and zeal which are in him, were gathered in the hour of secret prayer. Again and again let it be said: the Parish Priest must be holy; he must be spiritually-minded; he must be living the inner life of the Spirit of God; and he must be *felt* to be all this.

---

* Charles Marriott's 'Hints on Private Devotion,' is strongly recommended to such as desire to attain to habits of devotion.

There is an instrumentality for personal and spiritual advancement which cannot be passed over in treating of the private life of the Parish Priest. Probably no external aid in the attainment of personal holiness is more powerful than that of the Retreat. Even the most earnest clergy are often "cumbered about much serving," and sorely need the refreshment and peace of a brief interval in the midst of their work in which to sit at their Master's Feet. The multiplicity of occupation with very many is a great hindrance to the calmness of devotion, and a few days in which to turn their thoughts from the external to the internal, from their work to themselves, is a great blessing to such. The testimony of those who have joined in Retreats is almost unanimous in witnessing to their extreme blessedness. However doubtfully some have gone to them, they have come away in deep gratitude for the help and comfort found in them. The time spent in prayer, both public and private, the simple, earnest, suggestive, "meditations," given usually three times in the day, the self-imposed silence for a considerable part of the time, the absence of interruptions and distracting business, often the brotherly counsel of the conductor, all these things help to make the days of a Retreat days of singular profit to the soul. Of course everything depends on the selection of a good conductor, since all the meditations are given by him. He must be a man of much experience and of deep personal piety. Having said this much in strong commendation of Retreats for the clergy, we are bound to add that this inestimable means of spiritual advancement has been as yet adopted by only one school in the Church of England. This is deeply to be regretted. It is of no little importance to rescue Retreats from a party character, and to make them more widely useful. It is probable that some dislike the name, as of Roman origin. It is true that both name and idea are borrowed from the Roman Church. Yet there is absolutely nothing in their nature which should make them less fitted for the "Evangelical" than for the extreme "High Church" school, and surely no section of the Church can afford to refuse any proved instrument for raising the spiritual tone and level of the clergy. It is earnestly to be hoped that a mere name (and it is hard to invent a better) will not be allowed to narrow the influence of a plan to which, in itself, scarcely any one can find an objection.

In connection with this point we venture to name a long-cherished wish that our bishops could make at least the two last Ember days at their Ordinations into a sort of Retreat for the candidates. If the examinations could be over on the Thursday, and the result known, how profitably might the Friday and Saturday be spent in purely spiritual preparation for the most solemn and affecting day of Ordination; the bishop or his chaplain conducting at least two meditations on each of these days, which might be spent in great privacy, only broken by the simplest meals, and the bishop occupying some portion of the time in seeing each of the candidates privately with a view to spiritual counsel and fatherly advice. We are sure that such a plan would help many a young man to take a far higher view of his holy calling, and to approach Ordination in a far more earnest frame of mind than is often the case at present.

From the more personal aspect of the Private Life of a Parish Priest we pass naturally to the more social aspect. The clergyman's bearing and tone in society are of the utmost moment. Nothing is more harmful to the cause of Christianity and of the Church than the inconsistency we sometimes see between the clergyman in the church and the clergyman in the drawing-room. How often has the whole effect and influence of some impressive sermon been marred and destroyed by meeting the preacher in society, and finding him frivolous and worldly in his tone and conversation. It is not intended to imply that he is of necessity frivolous in mind or worldly in disposition. It is the borrowing of the ordinary frivolous and worldly tone of society—not from any admiration of it, but from the natural habit of accommodating oneself to one's company—which is meant. The Parish Priest often feels the hollowness and weariness of frivolous social intercourse. So do others besides the Parish Priest. Many a young girl who, for conformity's sake, chatters as idly as any, absolutely despises the idle chatter, and longs to hear higher and nobler things spoken of. *She* cannot break the outside shell of a conventional triviality. But the Parish Priest surely can, and ought to do so. He is too often a hypocrite in society—pretending, not to be better, but worse, —not to be more earnest, but less, than he is. He must be, at least to some degree, responsible for the tone of the society in

which he mixes. Two things seem needed, if he would raise the tone of society. 1. He should aim at a certain gravity (σεμνότης) of manner, making it apparent that he does not ever forget his sacred office, or the responsibility he is under of being an example to the flock. He will be simple, natural, kindly, unaffected, not gloomy or sanctimonious; but, at the same time, he will be calm, temperate, careful, and guarded; "grave in all his ways," as George Herbert says. In short, his manner will be all it should be, if he will only so demean himself as he would if he could know that one of those present was about to seek his counsel and aid in spiritual things, or that he was about shortly to minister to one of them on a death-bed. May it not be that his mere thoughtlessness of manner may repel one who might otherwise seek his counsel, or may banish him from the bedside where he might otherwise have been the messenger of peace? It has been well said, "Oh! if we could only be moderately silent! Better be moderately eloquent in preaching and modest of speech in society than brilliantly eloquent in the pulpit and of flashing wit in the drawing-room." Let it be also remembered by the clergy that the servants in the houses where they visit fail not to note and discuss their bearing and conversation; and who knows how much a clergyman's influence may be injured, and souls repelled from his ministry, by such an impression of lightness or triviality as may thus be conveyed? We desire to add our conviction that the avowed observance of the appointed Fast-days, such as the whole season of Lent and the weekly commemoration of the Saviour's death, by not dining out on such days, is important, not only to the clergyman himself in his private life; but also to his parish, which thus learns a lesson of respect for the Church's rules, and is led to reflect upon the real value of acts and seasons of abstinence. 2. The second need of the Parish Priest in his social intercourse is courage—courage to speak out for the truth and the right—courage to condemn a false, low, worldly sentiment—courage to lift the conversation, if opportunity occur, to a higher level—courage to show, in all simplicity and gentleness, that he is not ashamed of the Gospel of Christ. St. Augustine has some noteworthy words in condemnation of the cowardice which is silent when sin deserves rebuke: "O hireling, thou sawest the wolf coming and fled-

dest! Perchance he answers, and says, 'Lo, here I am; I have not fled.' Thou hast fled, because thou hast held thy peace. Thou didst hold thy peace, because thou wast afraid. Fear is the flight of the mind. In body thou stoodest; in spirit thou fleddest" (Hom. in S. John x. 13). Is it not the case that in travelling, and when away from home, the Parish Priest is often neglectful of his calling? He is away from his parish, and so feels freed from all responsibility as regards men's souls, not remembering and acting upon George Herbert's wholesome rule: "The country parson, when a just occasion calleth him out of his parish, leaveth not his ministry behind him, but is himself wherever he is." In truth, God gives him at such times many priceless opportunities of doing his Master's work. It often needs both self-denial and courage to speak seriously to a fellow-traveller who is a stranger, yet an opening very often occurs for such conversation, and we cannot doubt that opportunities wilfully neglected will be brought into the Judgment of the Great Day. Might it not also be well if, without parade or ostentation, the Parish Priest were not ashamed to take out and read his book of private devotion in a railway carriage? In this respect the Roman Catholic Priest certainly puts the English Clergyman to shame. It is a high standard which is set before the Parish Priest. For the matter of that, it is a high standard which is set before us all. But "*he goeth before them.*" Surely, if all, much more he, should have his conversation in heaven. His conduct should at all times and in all places be that of one who is a guide of souls to heaven, and whose study it is to give "no offence in anything, that the ministry be not blamed."

It may be desirable to allude here briefly to the spirit of the Parish Priest towards opponents. It is probable that he will meet with opposition at times, perhaps with bitter and provoking opposition. But be it a serious and malignant enmity, or be it a petty and tiresome unreasonableness—be it in great things or be it in small—one rule is distinct and universal. The minister of Jesus Christ must show that he *can never* take offence. He must always meet ignorant presumption with loving gentleness, insolence with meekness, insults with unconcern. He must study the *ἀνεξικακία* of St. Augustine. We need not say, for One has said it whom we all profess to obey,

that he must return good for evil; and where one has injured and wronged him, seek an early occasion of doing a kindness. This is hard for the natural man. But the Parish Priest should have conquered the natural and put on the spiritual.

It is necessary to say a few words as to sports and amusements. These will surely be sparingly indulged in by the faithful and earnest Parish Priest. It is not only that his time is not his own, and that the diligent pastor will not have leisure for such things, though this is much. But they do undoubtedly lower the tone and lessen the influence of the Parish Priest. It is enough to ask, Would one looking about for a clergyman to consult as to his spiritual state select a hunting, or a dancing, or a card-playing parson? Do these things increase or lessen the respect in which a clergyman is held? Do not even cricket and croquet require to be restrained within very moderate limits? We would guard against being supposed to look with a puritanical horror upon amusements in themselves healthful and harmless. We lay down no stringent rules. Let the pastor only take care that his heart is given to Christ, and to the flock Christ has committed to his trust, and this matter will sufficiently take care of itself.

There are certain pursuits and amusements which, from their pure and elevating character, have not the effect which has been ascribed to the last-mentioned class, but which may, nevertheless, stand in the way of the usefulness of the Parish Priest. The Parish Priest who is better known as a learned geologist, or an ardent botanist, or a successful gardener, or an accomplished artist, or a devoted photographer, than as a diligent pastor, is surely forgetful of his Ordination vows. Such pursuits are by no means to be either blamed or discouraged; but, to be innocent, they must certainly be the mere fringe to the daily life, and not its texture. A laborious Parish Priest who makes geology his refreshment in his spare moments does well. A laborious geologist who gives the fragments of his time and thought to his parish work does ill.

Much secular employment is a snare. There are obvious reasons why it is better that the Parish Priest should not be a magistrate, and no less obvious ones why it is better that he should take no forward part in political contests.

We come now to a very important branch of our subject,

namely, reading. The Dean of Norwich (Goulburn), in his Letter to the Bishops upon the Functions of Cathedrals, says every clergyman should demand two things—leisure for devotion, and leisure for study. In our larger town parishes the latter (and sometimes even the former) is very difficult to get. Yet without it the Parish Priest must greatly suffer. Do we suppose that the young deacon just ordained is thoroughly furnished in all needful erudition—a learned Biblical critic, a well-read Church historian, a profound theologian, a skilled analyst of human nature, a well-versed liturgical scholar—so that, without fresh acquisitions of knowledge, he will be able, while life lasts, to pour forth fresh instalments from his exhaustless store, perennially bringing "forth out of his treasure things new and old"? Alas! the young deacon has scarcely laid the first course of the fabric of a clerical education, and unless he goes on learning himself, how is it possible he can become the teacher of others? How can his sermons escape becoming the meagre jejune platitudinarian effusions they so often are, if he is always giving out and never taking in? Most Parish Priests could get two hours a day for study, if they were determined to do so, and the busiest could surely get one. And even one hour a-day, regularly and well used, would be of value. By "well used," we mean used in reading that which is of real value. How many ill-stored minds feed themselves in these days upon no better sustenance than pamphlets and newspapers. We want more of a theology which shall be pamphlet-proof, as Mr. Heygate says in his admirable little book 'Ember Hours.' But first of all there must be, as the foundation of all other study, a diligent study of Holy Scripture. "Too many have touched our garments, because we are men; we must go touch His garment, who is all Truth, to replenish our poverty. Our pitcher is empty: we must go to the Fountain" (Heygate). And then, after that, must come sound standard divinity. The Parish Priest will not forget that one of the questions to which he answered in his Ordination was this: "Will you be diligent in prayer, and in reading of the Holy Scriptures, and in such studies as may help to the knowledge of the same, laying aside the study of the world and of the flesh?" There is an old clergyman in a small country parish who has given a title for holy orders to many a young deacon, retaining each one but

for two years. He speaks to them, when they come to him, thus: "Now, in this small parish, you will have much spare time. This I mean you to employ in reading. You will never have such an opportunity again. I can go and talk to the old women. And I can tell you what to read, and lend you books. I mean you to go from here at the end of two years with a fair start in theological reading." How many a Parish Priest, who has no leisure now, would be thankful to have had such a chance of laying up some little store for future use. It is impossible to do more than touch upon this great subject of study now. We must leave it, only protesting against that frittering away of precious hours in all manner of desultory occupations, which is such a temptation to the clergyman who has not strength of mind or resolution enough to read systematically and with concentration.

From the closet to the study; from the study to the parish; —this is the natural order; and though we have already strayed away into the drawing-room and the railway carriage, this was only in tracing out the effect of a devout life and personal holiness in the ordinary mien and conversation of the Parish Priest. We come, then, now to his Private Ministrations, and, as was said at the first, in these his great aim should be *thoroughness*. It can hardly be doubted that indolence is a besetting sin of the pastoral office. The fact that the Parish Priest has no external rules to bind him in the details of his work, that he is master of his own time, that there is no one on earth to take account of the spending of his time,—this presents a very serious temptation to the naturally indolent and unsystematic. Some years ago the 'Times,' in a series of articles upon the idleness of the clergy,—articles which, with all their uncharitableness and exaggeration, could never have been written but for the vein of truth which ran through them,—recommended that the bishops should exact from every clergyman a diary of his pastoral work, to be sent in periodically; and the same proposal was renewed by a layman at the recent Church Congress held in Liverpool. We are not sure that either bishops or clergy would relish such a system of minute investigation; but such suggestions set one thinking, and one's thoughts end in this,—that, if the remedy be impracticable, the disease may nevertheless be there. Thank God, a vast number

of the clergy are now hard at work. It is a most hopeful sign that, difficult as it is to meet with curates now, it is far more difficult to meet with curates for small and easy parishes than for large and laborious ones. But, with all this, it is impossible not to be aware that there is need of the greatest watchfulness in the Parish Priest lest he yield to the indolence, or to the desultoriness so near akin to indolence, to which his position of self-dependence will so often tempt him. Nothing will save him from this snare except an intense realisation of the responsibilities of his calling, and the daily renewed offering of his time and strength to his Master's service. His time is not his own: it belongs to Christ, and to Christ's flock, which he is set to tend. Let his rule be this: to love Christ first, then the Church, then his parish, and all else far below, and he will not need to be warned against wasting the time, which will seem to him all too short for the great work he has to do.

Of the Private Ministrations of the Parish Priest, Pastoral Visiting is by far the most constant and laborious; while no work he has to do, whether public or private, can exceed in importance the Visitation of the Sick. This latter is so vast and momentous as well as so distinct a work that to treat it cursorily in an essay like the present would be impossible. Happily there are many books to aid the Parish Priest in this most momentous, as well as most difficult, of his duties. The more immediate preparation of souls for death and for judgment may well make the most experienced and successful Parish Priest exclaim, "Who is sufficient for these things?" We will therefore leave this part of Pastoral Visiting with the single remark that here above all is there need of *thoroughness* in dealing with the soul, and corresponding danger of hollowness and superficiality.

The faithful Parish Priest will not be content without regular house to house visiting of his parish, unless indeed this is absolutely impossible from its size. In country parishes it is always possible, and there at any rate the old saying, "A house-going parson makes a church-going people," is invariably found to be true. Quintilian gives a quaint illustration of the comparative value of preaching and of individual dealing with souls,—in which latter, of course, lies the main importance of Pastoral Visiting,—asking how you would best fill with water a large number of narrow-necked vessels (and which of us is not a narrow-necked

vessel?), whether by pouring a little into the mouth of each, or by getting all together in a large room, and throwing pailfuls of water over them?

The Parish Priest should devote his afternoons to his parish, giving it three or four hours daily. Of course there will be many interruptions to this, but Parochial Visiting should be regular and systematic, and not lightly interfered with. It is just here that the absence of definite rules for work, and the freedom of action allowed to the Parish Priest, are so apt to rob his parish of its due share of his time and labour. Various innocent amusements, and even laudable occupations, are allowed to diminish in a very blameworthy degree the amount of his pastoral devotion to his flock. A diary has been mentioned in connection with a curious suggestion of the 'Times' newspaper. It is not intended to indorse that suggestion, but a diary of his work is a necessity to the Parish Priest, not for his bishop to scrutinise, but for himself. It may be of use to some of the younger clergy to know that in a country parish of wide extent it is very easy to average from 20 to 25 pastoral visits weekly for the whole year, allowing for many interruptions, and a very liberal amount of holiday. Less than this should satisfy no one.

It has also been found an excellent plan to devote certain seasons, such as Advent and Lent, to the more careful and thorough visiting of the parish, allowing no interruption except the most urgent. At such times an average of six visits a-day is attainable.

It is also suggested as desirable to make these special systematic visitations of the parish bear upon some particular point which may be mentioned in every house, such as Private or Family Prayer, Holy Communion, Scripture Reading, &c., the pastor being furnished with such tracts or other publications as may be useful in enforcing the point selected.*

The difficulty in parochial visiting, as all who have tried it well know, is to avoid mere friendly conversational visits, and to give to the visits a distinctly pastoral character. It is by no means affirmed that the Parish Priest can always succeed in

---

* Jackson's 'Penny Pocketbook of Prayers and Hymns' (Warne), is very strongly recommended for such purpose, as a help to the practice of Private Prayer.

doing this, much less that every visit which is of a friendly rather than a pastoral character is thrown away and so much lost time. Nor should religious conversation be unnaturally dragged in where it is unwelcome and inopportune. But surely the Pastor should bear about in his heart such an intense consciousness of his divine work, and such an earnest longing to speak words which may help men heavenward, that those he visits, whether of the richer or of the poorer of his parishioners, should never feel it unnatural for the conversation to take a religious turn, and that no opportunity of saying something concerning the one thing needful should be ever let slip. In many houses of the poor religious conversation is always natural and welcome; and it is said oftener than some think, "Our clergyman called to-day, but he said nothing to do us good, and gave us no prayer, so he might as well have stopped away,"—these or like words. Undoubtedly it is often shyness and reserve which causes this silence concerning heavenly things. It may sometimes (may it not?) be a lack of relish for heavenly things themselves. This is also certainly true, namely, that many an educated layman, to whom the Parish Priest least supposes that religious conversation would be welcome, would be deeply grateful to him if he would only have the courage to break the ice of conventional reticence upon that which should be the subject of profoundest interest to both. Let the Pastor bear in mind that he goes about with a message for all, and remember what has been already quoted from St. Augustine about the fleeing of the hireling who careth not for the sheep. It would be well for him, and for his people, if he acted in the spirit of other words of the same holy father—words than which it would be hard to find nobler, and which shall therefore be given in the original language—"Si non me audieritis, et tamen ego non tacuero: animam meam liberabo. Sed nolo salvus esse sine vobis" (Serm. xvii. in Ps. xlix. 2). It should here be added that it is a great help to the Pastor when visiting the houses of those who value his visits and receive him as the minister of Christ (and this especially in the case of the sick), to enter always with the words of salutation on his lips, "Peace be to this house, and to all that dwell in it."

Probably next to Parochial Visiting, the Parochial School will

claim the largest portion of the Private Ministrations of the Parish Priest. This, like the Visitation of the Sick, is a subject which cannot be usefully discussed in the brief space which could be allotted to it here. Therefore we shall confine ourselves to one important recommendation. Except in exceedingly burdensome parishes, the Parish Priest will do well to conduct the opening service of prayer and praise in his school in person, and to give a lesson in Holy Scripture, the Church Catechism, or the Prayer-Book, immediately afterwards for half-an-hour, daily. This will occupy three-quarters of an hour, and no other equal portion of his day will be better spent. The regularity of habit, the discipline of punctuality, and we may add the actual benefit he will derive from the teaching, will be invaluable to himself, while the advantages to the tone and welfare of the school, as well as to the individual children whom he thus learns to know, and who thus learn to know him, are too obvious to dwell upon. It is interesting to find that the practice above recommended was that of the saintly author of the Christian Year.* It has been found in some parishes (both town and country) possible to combine the School Opening with the Daily Prayer of the Church. In the instances referred to, the elder classes in the school are required to attend the Daily Prayer at a quarter before nine, and after the prayers receive in Church their daily catechetical lesson from the Clergyman.

We must now speak of a very delicate and difficult question, namely that of Private Confession. Whether for good or for ill this is, all will admit, one of the most important—possibly the most important—of the Private Ministrations of the Parish Priest. He is dealing in Confession with the inmost actings of a guilty soul, and it is a matter of life and death. But should there be such a thing as Private Confession at all? Many, feeling how easily such a practice may be abused, knowing how terribly it has been often abused, would answer this question with a very resolute "No." We can sympathize with all our hearts in the dread of what is popularly known as "priest-craft," in the hatred of all undue influence and of all misused power derived from such a source as the Confessional. We believe

---

* See the Letter of the Rev. P. Young in the Appendix to the 'Life of Keble.'

that *enforced* Confession, as in the Roman Church, is an evil of gigantic magnitude. We believe that *habitual* Confession, however voluntary, would be generally an enervating and unwholesome practice. Its tendency is to become unreal and formal, or, if real and honest, to divest the soul of that sense of personal responsibility of judgment in moral and spiritual things which God has laid upon it, and to destroy its true manliness and self-dependence. Moreover, it is right to add that, had habitual Private Confession been the practice of the Apostolic Church, it is inconceivable that distinct and unmistakeable traces of it should not appear in the inspired Epistles as well as in those of the Apostolic Fathers. At the same time not only is the practice of Private Confession of very early use in the Church, but also it is inherent in the very nature of the relation existing between one who has to train souls for heaven and the souls he has to train, that a very intimate knowledge on the part of the former of the inner state and feelings of the latter, should at times be indispensable for the imparting and receiving of any real benefit. Thus our Church is most distinct in offering Private Confession to unquiet and troubled consciences, inviting to it in the Exhortation preparatory to Holy Communion, and urging to it in the Visitation of the Sick. And here we think our Church has shown exceeding wisdom. She plainly treats Private Confession as a strong medicine for an acute disease, and not as wholesome food for the ordinary life of the soul. She uses the physician, but in order through returning health to dispense with his services, not in order that his visits may become a daily necessity to the chronic valetudinarian. It will hardly be disputed that, if the Church of England is right in offering this relief to troubled consciences in the two cases of Sickness and of preparation for Holy Communion, a fair analogy would allow the same relief at other times; only this same analogy would limit such other times to seasons of special trouble and difficulty. The general subject of Private Confession divides itself into three main parts, Confession proper, Direction, and Absolution. There are few who will not admit that the unburdening of the soul to some "discreet and learned Minister of God's Word," nay, even to some grave and experienced friend, would be often of the greatest value to the sinner. The self-examination, the

self-knowledge, the humiliation, the penitence, the struggle against sin, implied in such an act, can hardly fail to have great and wholesome effect; and though they doubtless may exist apart from such Confession, yet by it they are deepened and intensified. Again, equally ready will be the admission that such "ghostly counsel and advice" as a free Confession may enable the "Minister of God's Word" to bestow, may be of the very greatest service to the penitent. How continually is he longing to get at the real state of heart of the various members of his flock with whom he has to deal, that his words to them may not be the vague general remarks they are so frequently obliged to be, but may be addressed to the present and deepest needs of the hearer. He is always drawing his bow at a venture, instead of aiming at the one spot in the heart which should be struck; and thus he fails, and is conscious that he fails, in the *thoroughness* of his dealings with souls. Especially is this the case in the solemn and anxious time of preparation for Confirmation. What would the Parish Priest often give to know what is the besetting sin, what the real state of heart, what the true spiritual needs, of the dull, or shy, or awkward, or plausible lad, whom he is seeking to move to true penitence and faith and love. Since, then, few unprejudiced persons would find fault with the opening of the troubled conscience to the Clergyman with a view to his counsel and advice, it would seem that the chief objections which are felt, and so strongly felt, to the system of Private Confession would group themselves around the third part of the subject, namely the priestly Absolution, and we think that there is ground here for much caution and jealousy. The authoritative conveyance of God's message of pardon by His commissioned ambassador possesses undoubtedly great comfort and assurance for the true penitent who cannot quiet his conscience with the general promises of God's Word. But, if there is one truth certain in that Word, and to be held fast steadily by us, it is that sins confessed in true penitence to God are pardoned without any Confession to, or Absolution by, the human priest. A frequent use of private Absolution certainly endangers the holding fast of that truth. Again, although the Absolution is always by its very terms conditional, yet the fallibility of the human priest as to the true state of heart of the recipient of Absolution causes great peril of the saying of "Peace, peace, when there is no peace," and of

thus salving over an unhealed wound. Few things could be more utterly ruinous to the soul than the periodical receiving of Absolution for faults only half repented of, and continually recurring. We are deeply conscious of our inadequate handling of this great question, but it appeared to us of importance at the present time to express our conviction that Private Absolution should be administered with great caution, and only in cases of unmistakeable penitence coupled with distress of mind. In ordinary cases, those who desire comfort may be reminded that the Church has provided the "benefit of Absolution" for the penitent and believing in her daily services;—a frequency of repetition which some (perhaps not altogether without reason) have complained of as tending to lessen the solemnity and impressiveness of this comforting message of peace. It may be added that, whereas in the case of the sick a special form of Absolution is enjoined, no such injunction is given in the other case contemplated by our Church. Although, therefore, the Absolution in the Visitation of the Sick is the only form of private Absolution we have, yet there is nothing to prevent the priest selecting another in other cases; the far more ancient form in the Communion Office, for instance, being perfectly appropriate for individual use.

Preparation for Confirmation has been already mentioned, but must not be passed by with an incidental remark. The great blessedness of this work is that it is (or at least ought to be) the most *thorough* of any of the Parish Priest's dealings with his people. He has at this time a priceless opportunity of becoming acquainted with the character and inner life of the young people in his parish. He will ascertain in private interviews the habits of his candidates as to Prayer, the Reading of the Bible, and Self-examination. Much as he will value the opportunity of instruction in classes, he will value still more the opportunity of private intercourse with the candidates. These private interviews must be very kind, loving, gentle, and encouraging. In them the Parish Priest must take every care to set the moral preparation of the heart infinitely above the intellectual preparation of the head. Every endeavour must be made to get the candidate to speak frankly and openly, and although this endeavour will certainly not succeed in the greater number of instances, yet it will be something to have impressed

the young person with the probably novel idea that the clergyman really takes an individual interest in the sheep and lambs of his flock, and is not only willing but anxious that they should look upon him as a friend whom they may fearlessly consult in any trouble or difficulty. It need scarcely be added that every private interview should be ended with prayer, and that the prayer should, if possible, touch upon the special subject of the previous conversation. Although not sympathizing with all parts of it, we cannot forbear recommending Mr. Newland's Book on Confirmation as an example of *thoroughness* in this important part of the Parish Priest's Ministrations. A great many of Mr. Newland's hints and plans must commend themselves to those who are doctrinally most opposed to him. The extreme care which Mr. Keble bestowed on this part of his work will be found noticed in Mr. Young's letter in the Appendix to his Life by Coleridge. We can only add on this subject that the season of preparation for Confirmation will to the faithful Parish Priest be a season of much prayer, much labour, much anxious thought and care. It will be at once the most laborious and the most blessed portion of all his Private Ministrations.

Following upon Confirmation would naturally arise the anxious question as to the retention of an influence over the newly confirmed. The mere enumeration of the names of Communion Class, Bible Class, Sunday School, and Night School must suffice as suggestive of instrumentalities which are too well known to need detailed description, and which the faithful Parish Priest will not despise. But we are convinced that the only way to maintain a real and effectual influence over the confirmed is by private interviews from time to time, which should follow some systematic plan, such as being the work assigned to some particular season, and in which enquiry should always be made as to the fulfilment of the Confirmation vows; and this not generally only, but in respect of such particulars as have been the subject of special advice during the season of preparation. It is obvious that, in order to carry out this, a record of private interviews, such as Mr. Newland so strongly recommends, must be kept and consulted.

The subject of Guilds or Parochial Societies is now receiving increased attention, and is one of no little difficulty. There is

no doubt that the dissenting bodies possess far more *esprit de corps* than we do, and that this, although partly attributable to the fact that a protesting minority is in its very nature more united and sympathetic than a society of larger bounds and traditional belief, is in a great measure fostered by the principle of giving, so far as may be, "to every man his work." The banding together of the more earnest members of the Church in a parish for common work, with some few simple rules and a form of intercession for the parish to be used by them, is an obvious means of promoting that sympathy and fellowship in which it has been said Churchmen are greatly lacking. But then arises the following question, which is given in the words in which it was put to the writer of the present Essay by a thoughtful friend:—"Shall the constitution of such a society be broad enough to embrace all Teachers, Tract-lenders, School-managers, &c., or shall it be severe enough to keep out the cold, and deepen by its exclusiveness and discipline the fervency of those who have stuff enough in them for devoted lives? There is, no doubt, an instinct for real strictness and self-denial in our nature—strongly so in many characters; and there is no little need for it in these lax days. Gideon's small army was stronger than his large one. I imagine there is more need to make good people holy than to increase the number of ordinarily religious souls; and I suppose the former is also the surest way of accomplishing the latter. Quantity lowers quality, but quality makes quantity." It must be allowed that the above quotation advocates a far higher aim than that which simply points to fellowship in common work, yet we cannot conceal our hesitation as to the expediency of a Church within a Church, and, sympathizing wholly with the views expressed as to the need of the "little army," we are disposed to think that it may be better that a Parochial Society should have some obvious and definite boundary line, such as that of work for the Church or the Poor, and that the raising of the few to a higher life of holiness should rather be a work to be done with individual souls. We speak, however, with much diffidence, feeling that the question is as yet in an experimental state, and that the thoughtful efforts of good men will, in all probability, ere long bring it to a practical solution.

Perhaps among the Private Ministrations of the Parish Priest

we should not omit all mention of Cottage Lectures, and Mission Rooms and Chapels. It is marvellous what new life at once springs up and clusters around each fresh centre of parochial ministration, and how in outlying districts, in which little or no Church feeling seemed to exist, the Mission-Room or School-Chapel at once forms a new focus of work and interest and activity. It is now generally admitted that it is a mistake to detach new and poorly-endowed districts from their mother-churches, and that large parishes, if fairly endowed, are best worked from a common centre, by means of services, subordinate to those of the Parish Church, held in different parts of the parish. Where no more regular provision can be made, some little may be done in this way by means of Cottage Lectures.

And now to conclude by gathering up these sketchy and imperfect hints into one great rule which shall embrace all and far more than all. Let the Parish Priest, in all he is or does, take for his model the great High Priest Himself: let the human Pastor follow in the track of the Good Shepherd. The aim is lofty, dazzling, awful. The feeble man trembles and shrinks back as he looks up so high; yet without a lofty aim nothing is accomplished. The copy will be a long way from the model; the faltering footsteps will lag far behind the holy Form that goes before; but it is something to be a copy, even though faint and faulty—something to be on the track, even though far behind. Can we picture to ourselves the perfect Parish Priest? He would be very like Christ. This is our conception: —a man pure, holy, and spotless in his life; a man of much prayer; in character meek, lowly, and infinitely compassionate; of tenderest love to all; full of sympathy for every pain and sorrow, and devoting his days and nights to lightening the burdens of humanity; utterly patient of insult and enmity; utterly fearless of speaking the truth and rebuking sin; ever ready to answer every call, to go wherever bidden, in order to do good; wholly without thought of self; making himself the servant of all; patient, gentle, and untiring in dealing with the souls he would save; bearing with ignorance, wilfulness, slowness, cowardice, in those of whom he expects most; sacrificing all, even life itself, if need be, to save some.

W. WALSHAM HOW.

ESSAY VI.

ENGLISH DIVINES OF THE SIXTEENTH AND SEVENTEENTH CENTURIES.

By ARTHUR WEST HADDAN, B.D.,
Rector of Barton-on-the-Heath; Hon. Canon of Worcester; and
Formerly Fellow of Trinity College, Oxford.

CONTENTS OF ESSAY VI.

- The Caroline Divines, and those who sprang from them, the representative Divines of the English Church.
  - What they have done for us;
    - Practically,
    - Doctrinally.
  - Their claim to be studied as part of a theological training.
  - No ground for abandoning their doctrinal stand-point.
    - On some external points defective or out of date:
      - 1. Why they failed to win the middle class;
      - 2. Toleration;
      - 3. Relation of Church to State.
  - Their "via media" in essential doctrines unshaken.
    - *e. g.* 1. Rule of Faith—Scriptures—Councils;
    - 2. Eucharistic Presence and Sacrifice;
    - 3. Reverence due to the Blessed Virgin.
    - 4. Our position in reference to Rome.
- Conclusion.

Κατὰ τὴν οὐσίαν μεσότης ἐστὶν ἡ ἀρετή, κατὰ δὲ τὸ ἄριστον καὶ τὸ εὖ ἀκρότης.—*Aristot. Eth. Nic.* II. 6.

ENGLISH DIVINES OF THE SIXTEENTH AND SEVENTEENTH CENTURIES.

Many schools of thought have come and gone in the post-Reformation Church of England. One school only has so mastered that Church as to survive all changes, and to recover after each period of transitory failure with a persistent vitality. The "Latitude" school, with its incongruous Platonic phase in the writings of Smith and More,—the single stars who had no following, like Ussher, Mede, or Cudworth,—the ecclesiastico-legal school, such as Gibson, and Wake, and Wilkins, and Nicolson,—the evidential and apologetic school of Paley and Watson, and of the far mightier Butler,—all had their day of prominence, and then left their special work behind them, the one thing they had been given to do, to be made use of by men of another temper. The earlier Calvinistic period, and again, far later, the semi-Arian views of Clarke and his contemporaries, happily passed away without a trace of lasting effect. While Newton, and Venn, and Cecil, and their friends, wrought, indeed, a revival of personal religion, for which we may all well be thankful, but left behind them nothing that can with seriousness be called a theology at all. One school only, that of the Caroline divines, has so found a natural home in Church formularies, has become so firmly rooted in the hearts of Churchmen, has so thoroughly created Church theology, as to have lived on hitherto through all vicissitudes of politics, or society, or thought; and not to have revived only, but to have made progress, after each temporary eclipse. Its "catenæ" begin with Elizabeth's reign, and spread on continuously until the present day; although at times, as in the dreary latter years of last century, the torch is handed on by a rarer chain of bearers. Its views have been all along the "orthodox" views, the "good old Church" views, the views that the friends of the Church have

been concerned to defend, and with which her foes have taunted her. It has possessed the mind of Churchmen; it has furnished the representative names of the Church; and to it, and to it absolutely, was committed, as a matter of fact, the last and still enduring legal settlement of the Church's authoritative formularies.

What, then, is this School? What have been its services? What its characteristics? or its defects? Has cause been indeed shown why it should now at length lose its hold upon us? Is it destined to die out, as many feelings and practices connected with it certainly have died out? Or have changes of opinion and information only proved that, as with all human schools, the forms of one age must no doubt be modified to suit another, and this or that incidental error stripped off—nay, if you please, that, like all other schools of thought, it must change its attitude in the face of the changed mental conditions of the age, and rest, for instance, upon its merits and no longer upon traditional authority—but that in its foundations it is immoveable?

Consider, first, what these divines, under God's blessing, have done for us. They have formed a school (1) which has given us the only theology we have worthy the name, learned, thorough, and systematic; which helped largely to give us our English Bible; which reckons one name, at least, in its list, that rivals Shakespeare's, and that has been elaborately contrasted, by such a judge as Coleridge, with Milton in literary eminence. And the same school has furnished us (2) with an ideal of holy life, so thoroughly identified with the characteristic good points of the English character, as is that suggested by the names of Boyle, and Nelson, and Evelyn, not to add other names, or modern ones down to this very day, which every one can supply; an ideal combining the practical and the sensible with the devotional temperament,* in a way both unique and English. It has given, further, to the educated Englishman (the epithet is emphasized intentionally), such unapproachable devotional aids as are to be found in Andrewes, Hall, and Taylor, in Ken, Patrick, Horneck, and Bishop Wilson: has enriched us with the unique devotional poetry of Herbert and his school, and has

---

* Even Nicholas Ferrar's ascetic family was no idle one. Regular and useful work occupied it continually.

supplied us with the model of the Country Parson, more quaintly and elaborately drawn than Chaucer's, in the inimitable work of the same Herbert. It originated again (3) our first Missionary efforts—and this, too, when its strength was failing; and our first attempts, in the way of guilds and brotherhoods, to stem the growing current of vice at home—both of them honourable features in the generally dreary beginning of last century; while at the same period it denounced and really checked, through the bold rebukes of the persecuted Collier, the wickedness of the then English stage, a protest so noble and so vigorous as to extort the unqualified admiration even of a Macaulay. It is a school (4) which has ever kept itself large-minded and vigorous, by looking up to no one great name, and trammelling itself to no merely human system; and which has been uniformly marked by a broad manliness of thought, as opposed to the servile balancing and counter-balancing of authorities, and to the parrot-like repetition of merely traditional formulae, which characterize so much of the theology of the Roman Communion; as opposed also to the unreal and elaborately ingenious schematizing, wherewith Puritan theology has presumed to dissect and analyze the dealings of God with man. And to come (5) to particular writers:—we find in it our most solid expositions of the Creed in Pearson and Jackson (not to mention the half-forgotten Heylin); the most solid defence of the fundamental doctrine of the Holy Trinity in Bishop Bull, maintaining not only the doctrine itself, but (in sharp contrast with the suicidal work of Petavius) the foundation also of all doctrine in the one sound view of the formation of Creeds, and of the true office of the Church in developing doctrine; our handiest evidential compendium in Leslie's well-known works, not to mention the celebrated "Moral Demonstration" in Taylor's *Ductor Dubitantium* (although evidence, no doubt, belongs principally to another school, and to one, as in Paley's case, closer on the borders of the critical period); the most practical and honest of *Eirenica* in Bishop Forbes of Edinburgh's exact and learned statement of the precise extent and of the origin of our theological differences with Rome; the sermons again, so opposite in style, yet monopolizing the privilege (a nearly singular one for sermons not Patristic) of being still read and studied after a time that nearly counts by centuries, of Andrewes and of Beveridge; the founda-

tion, although perhaps little more, of a critical Bible text in Walton's (for its date) marvellous Polyglot Bible, and of solid Patristic learning in Pearson, Thorndike, Beveridge, and Cave; the beginning, may I not also say, of our native antiquarian lore in the labours of Hickes, and of an Oriental school in those of Hyde and Pocock; our best native Church historians in Collier, and, so far as materials go, Wharton; the most solid defence of our position against the ancient, and *à fortiori*, the modern, claims of Rome, in the tough and vigorous sense of Bramhall, and (let me add) of Laud's too little studied Conference with Fisher; and lastly, in a wider circle of controversies, that mine of thought, and learning, and honest research, repaying well the labour of disinterring it, which lies buried under the involved and repulsive English of Thorndike. Mr. Keble's preface has shown us that Hooker,* too, may be fairly claimed for the same school, as substantially of the same principles, maintained in the like spirit and on the like foundation; although in one or two points he has, in words more than in fact, scarcely taken up the same ground. And it would be useless to add other names less than these, yet each of value in its own department. It is a school again (6) which never has spoken as a school, and rarely in any one instance, in a virulent, or uncharitable, or even vulgar tone; has never sentenced to hopeless condemnation, here or hereafter, either Romanist, or Schismatic; has refrained from branding other Churches as anti-Christ; has shrunk from imperilling men's faith by two-edged and dangerous arguments, like that *e. g.* of Petavius, above referred to, respecting the Antenicene belief; has never placed itself in hopeless opposition to fundamental laws of morality as Calvinism does, or, as Romanism, to plain facts of undeniable history, nor put itself, as do both systems, under the necessity of glossing away the clear sense

---

**E. g.*, the well-known quotation from him respecting the Real Presence, which after all means less than it is commonly pressed to mean; and his defence of the phrase Imputed Righteousness, which again, when taken with his firm assertion of the necessity of Sanctification also, means merely a way (dangerous or not according as it is used) of affirming a very precious Gospel truth. I do not see that his often-cited words in the former case mean more than Thorndike's assertion, that we need not inquire into the manner of the Presence in the elements "in the nature of the formal cause," provided we believe "that the Body and Blood of Christ become present in the sacrament," by virtue of the consecration "to the purpose" of reception. In Hooker's own words, they are "sacramentally presented" to us in the reception of the elements.

of Scripture. Lastly, while it has made all other schools in the Church, more or less plainly, "outsiders," it has itself survived the drain of its own noblest blood in the political Nonjuring secession, and contrived to outlive the corruption and immoral scepticism of the days of Walpole, and revived even after its terrible loss of earnest piety in the Wesleyan schism (itself in Wesley's person drawing its inspiration, so far as it was for good, from High Churchism), and after the unhappily too narrow and subjective (so called) "Evangelical" movement. And it lives still, after the unprecedentedly long duration (for any human school of thought) of three centuries, to supply the names which, if any one is asked to signalise the English Church, come spontaneously to every one's lips.

But it has deeper claims than even these to our allegiance. It began by freeing us from the domination of Calvin. It prevented at its outset any traces of Calvinism from finding their way into our authorised formularies, and saved the Articles from being Calvinised by additions, as the Westminster Assembly afterwards tried to Calvinise them by glosses; and it annihilated utterly and for ever that now (happily) inconceivable state of feeling which made a word of the Genevan autocrat of hyperpapal weight among English Churchmen. It rescued us, in a word, from that "ledger-like" and presumptuous unreality, which alone lends strength to the destructive part of Mr. Matthew Arnold's recent unhappy essay; and put away from us altogether such theology as that of the Synod of Dort.

But more than even this. It recalled and made sure to us our place in Christendom as a part of the Catholic Church; so that, on the one hand, no single name, however influential, has ever succeeded in usurping the right of branding with its own designation the Church of this land; and on the other, we have retained our title unbroken to be a branch of the Church Universal, as it has existed from the beginning. And the same line of doctrine regained for us also our heritage as rightful successors of the true Church of this country, ever since there was a Church of Christ in this country at all, with all the traditional sympathies and accepted privileges of the National Church. It has vindicated to us, again, an historical Christianity—a faith that does not rest upon the crude speculations of a single generation in a single crisis, much less upon those of

a single mind, but is guaranteed to us by the evidence of that Primitive Church which, whether better or not than ourselves, assuredly was in a position to know the truth better than we can know it—guaranteed to us, again, by the experience and the sifting of many and varied generations, and by the very history of the developments, whether legitimate or not, which have grown out of the original faith itself. It has secured to us, further, by getting rid of Calvinism, and by affirming, with the Catholic Church, the reality, by and through each Sacrament, of its own special gift of grace—that those Sacraments should not be evaporated into mere acts of man, into outward motives, or acted prayers; or become merely superfluous and uncertain seals of that which God's decree has already given, or refused to give, without any reference to them; but should be in truth outward signs conveying an inward grace. And it has obtained for us, further still—not indeed the title to an Apostolic ministry, for that we inherited, but—the belief in such a ministry, and the careful preservation of it, and the consciousness of the gifts which the possession of it bestows. The Creeds, and the Sacraments, and the Church are ours, through its means, with a fulness and a certainty we should otherwise have lacked. By its instrumentality, in short, it has come to pass that we feel ourselves to be a Church and not a Sect.

But yet again, that school has been to us a blessing, not only in the foundation of its doctrine, but in the completeness of it. Let a single doctrine be exaggerated out of its place, or dwelt upon too exclusively, and both that doctrine itself suffers for want of its proper counterparts, and other fundamental doctrines are apt to be dwarfed, or obscured, or laid aside, or utterly contradicted. Now, whatever else may be the defects or shortcomings of the great English theology, it has assuredly saved us, by the broad maintenance of the whole cycle of the Faith, from being labelled with the name of any one article of it, and from the dangerous consequences of such onesided narrowness. Its very principle of adherence to the Catholic Faith has given a proportionateness and a controlled orderliness to its teaching. It has been possible, under Lutheranism, for a Lutheran doctor formally to maintain that good works are pernicious to salvation; or yet again, that if you choose to think you are saved, then you are so. It is scarcely within the power of a rigid

Calvinist to escape making God at once the author and yet the punisher of sin. The *parecbasis* of Solifidian views has issued in declaring the Lord's Prayer unfit for Christian use. And the strict maintainers of absolute perseverance, following upon instantaneous conversion, have been driven to make sin no sin in the elect, and actual faith, on the other hand, to have been no faith at all, wherever the believer subsequently fell away. It is not too much to say that dilemmas and suicidal inferences like these press upon no English Churchman. And the tone and spirit of our great divines has, under God, saved us from them. There is no one doctrine which occupies in English theology the place which justification by faith alone occupies in Lutheranism, or the Divine decrees with Calvin, or Papal infallibility with Rome.

But the principle upon which our older theology is built has yet other claims upon our thankfulness. It is a principle that has within itself the power of self-rectification. If errors creep from time to time into the Church, the standard of the Primitive and Catholic Church, expounding the New Testament by the actual and historical results of the teaching of those who, under God, wrote the New Testament, is a plain rule, ever recalling those who hold it to the true faith. It is a principle, again, which covers, and which alone covers, our Reformation; for it means that we reformed the present Church by the Primitive and Catholic Church, the less by the greater, the corrupt and divided by the uncorrupt and united. And although the principle of *Athanasius contra mundum* holds good in rare crises and special circumstances, yet when the question is what was the truth once revealed, it would go hard with the bold denouncer of prevalent error, unless he had also the world past against the world present, the Church from the beginning against the present and corrupt Church, and the Church of the Scriptures to correct the Church of theology. It is a principle, lastly, which, more than has been commonly the case elsewhere, has led to an abstinence from excessive dogmatizing, has kept us free from over much and over subtle theory, has gone upon historical more than upon logical or, still less, merely sentimental grounds, and so has largely saved English theology, and English religious sentiment, from that prurience of development, and from that effeminacy of tone, which are, in truth, symptoms of an unhealthy, not of a vigorous life.

Look again from principles to results. On a broad and general view a Church system, like any other, may fairly be judged by its fruits. Now no one would wish for a moment to underrate the great amount of good that has arisen among us, at this time or that, from non-Church sources. And it would be wilful blindness, also, so to eulogize the tone of religious feeling among Englishmen as to ignore also its many and fearful shortcomings. Yet it can hardly be denied that, with all allowance for the influence of Nonconformist piety, the chief factor in the production of our present religious condition has been the Church, and the chief factor in the creation of the religious tone of the Church has been found in the great Church divines; and that to these, therefore, we owe very largely what we have been and what we are. And certainly a comparison of our past or even present religious condition with that of Continental communities results in this—that while the like causes have had the like effects, in their case as in ours, and fever fits of heresy, or deadness, or unbelief, have included ourselves when they existed among them, yet the evil has with us been ever checked sooner, and taken root less firmly, and reached to less virulent extremes; and has, in short, been counterbalanced by a special strength in our (so to call it) religious constitution. Less widespread intellectual activity, and other causes of an incidental kind, may have had some share in the result. But certainly it has never been possible with us, for the Divinity of our Lord and the Grace of the Holy Spirit to be pronounced open questions; and divines, for peace' sake, forbidden to preach about them; as once in Geneva. It was not the case in England, when a bitter Calvinism did bring about a Latitudinarian reaction there, as with the Whichcots and Mores, and the early Latitudinarians of the Restoration, that pitiless extremes, like those of the Synod of Dort, led to equal extremes in the other direction; such as was that, not of Arminius only (and the most extreme English Church writer in that direction came distinctly short of Arminius), but of the all but Socinian Episcopius. Nay, was not Socinus himself the natural, and virtually the actual, result of Calvinism in its first rise? And if the evil parentage of the first modern Atheism belongs to England, at least it was answered and died away; while in France and Holland and Germany—let the writings of Rénan and of Bruno Bauer, and the schools of Groningen and of

Leyden, let the Protestanten-Verein and the pistol-shot which in Berlin Cathedral was to put down the Creed, answer for what it has come to there, even now. Is it not a moral impossibility at present for any of these things to have found place in England in the same degree? Are not the parallel phenomena among ourselves mild and feeble in comparison, and checked and forced back from extremes by a stronger counterfeeling? And, if so, to whom do we owe it?

Turn from the essence to the accessories of religion, and here, too, we owe much to the school we are considering. Let the Puritans have the credit (and it is a great credit) of protesting against what might have been degraded into a Continental Sunday. Yet it was the work of the Church School, on the other side, so to settle the "Sabbath" controversy upon sound and reasonable grounds, as to rescue us from Judaism, and to deliver us (I say it in trembling) from a Scotch one. And if our present amount of ritual and of ceremonial is too little in the eyes of some among us, at least it is certain that the efforts of the Laudian divines (on principles, however, less of symbolism than of orderly decency) saved for us what we have. The recently published State papers prove conclusively, what, indeed, was pretty well certain before, the miserable disorder and irreverence to which Puritanism unchecked would otherwise have reduced us. But then, in the ceremonial of Laud, and Andrewes, and Cosin, the principle of bringing back omitted doctrine through the restored ritual of the older Service Books, deliberately displaced in the later ones, was not in question. It was simply a matter of much or little, so as to combine most perfectly with intelligent worship the offering to God of our best, and the conducting of God's service with becoming reverence and dignity, and with appropriate outward expression. Let the several times repeated language of Bramhall stand for the rest, both for what it says and for what it does not say; who maintains ceremonials as "adjuments of order, gravity, decency, modesty in the service of God, as expressions of those holy and heavenly desires and dispositions which we ought to bring along with us to the House of God, as helps of attention or devotion, furtherances of edification, visible instructors, the 'books of ignorant men, helps of memory, exercises of faith, the leaves that preserve the tender fruit, the shell which defends the kernel of religion from

contempt." And in the result—judging us by the idea of what an English service is meant and ought to be, and neither by the stiff and cold meagreness to which an irreligious deadness has too often reduced it in the past and passing generations, nor by the mere gathering together to hear and criticize a preacher, which is the model of those who sympathize with Dissent—in the result, I say, can there be any doubt but that, while in the Roman Communion ceremonial seems to have outgrown the very possibility of intelligent worship, in our own we have at least aimed at keeping its due place for the worship of the body as subservient to the worship of the soul, and have, in intention, neither forgotten nor exaggerated the right office of the senses? The very perfection of ceremonial is to lift us beyond itself. It becomes, otherwise, not a help but a hindrance. And if a silent and sitting congregation, listening to another man's prayers, may naturally make one that has escaped from it "shudder" to think of again enduring it, surely the silent albeit kneeling congregation, not so much listening to the words as watching the gestures (practically to them, even from their very number, unmeaning) of the priest who is acting them in their sight, is at the least equally unedifying. And here, as before, to whom do we owe it, that our ideal at any rate, if, alas! not often our practice, aims at delivering us from both?

Such, then, is a hasty and imperfect sketch of the work which the great English divines have done for us—a work which on its many sides constitutes for them, surely, beyond all dispute, a strong claim upon our hearty acceptance, literary, national, moral, theological,—a claim both for thoughtful study and for something more than even respectful consideration. Is there then, indeed, any shadow of reason now for giving up the position which they have made for us, and for throwing them aside as belonging to the past? One school, strong in intellect more than in numbers, and stronger still by its alliance with the outer world of mere unbelief, would have us forego Church and dogma as such altogether, and the Church school of doctrine of course among the rest. Recognising no such thing as a formal communication of truth from God to man, it would hold the Bible to be the product of the highest human powers, and, much more, the creeds to be merely "ecclesiastical hypotheses;" while the Church, to it, is nothing more than a national insti-

tution, framed so as to combine the maximum of acceptance with an ever shifting minimum of so-called belief. Another school, beginning with a revival of personal piety, has unhappily degenerated now into (mainly) a negation of Church and Sacraments; and while it limits religion to a purely individual relation between each soul separately and its Saviour, rests the evidence of that relation chiefly upon inward feelings; and in defining what it is, turns justification by faith out of a theological formula, denying human merit, into an ethical description, logically excluding man's sanctification; and requires in the believer, in effect, little more than an arbitrary determination to believe that he himself is saved. While a third school would set aside our old divines as having gone too far for truth and not far enough for logic, and wishes to undo the Reformation as a mistake that halted untenably between two positions, and which, in point of fact, ought doctrinally to be effaced. Such, at least, are the tendencies and extremes to which differing views among us point, although it is thankfully to be acknowledged, that the mass even of those, who might be roughly classed by such a division, fall far short of these extremes. And meanwhile a sort of feeling has been growing up among the great body of Churchmen, that our religious belief does require some kind of essential readjustment to make it harmonize with modern knowledge. There is a sort of waking up to a suspicion that old traditional views are perchance obsolete; and a shaking off of old Church doctrine in the face of these varied attacks upon it, intensified and strengthened, as no doubt they are, by the extreme and reckless language of those whom, for lack of a name, I must needs call Ritualists. It is well, then, to point out, under circumstances such as these, that at least the *onus probandi* rests upon those who assail Church views. An historical standing-ground is a weighty presumption. The right of possession is a vantage-ground theologically as well as legally. Those certainly think so who push the principle to the extreme of clutching at such a support for their own views in the crude unsettlement of some few months of the reign of Edward VI., as though that were the "rightful heritage of the English Church;" or who, again, select, as a "Christian leader" of his time, a single obscure bishop, best known as having been in perpetual and unsuccessful conflict with his own friends, viz. Hooper. But the fact

that, in real truth, a certain school of opinion has held possession of the Church for three centuries is assuredly a strong reason why that school should retain its place until very good grounds indeed have been produced for displacing it. And if to that school can be traced so much of what strength and goodness the Church can boast, that reason is all the stronger. Church feeling rallied round it at the time of the great Oxford movement. Have circumstances so altered, or are we so much wiser now than we were at the time of that movement, as to make it necessary and right for Churchmen to give up the old position of three centuries, and either in effect turn Dissenters, or else start afresh upon new principles in the very opposite direction—upon principles (for that is what present views really come to) new in part even to Rome herself, and from which our own older school distinctly held back?

As regards the study of our older divines, indeed, it is a pity in any event that writers so thorough should cease (as is possibly too much the case just now) to form the staple of our theological studies; and that in lieu of treatises, the mastery of which means the sound comprehension of all the bearings of their several subjects, and is also a real education of mind and reason by the study of patient and solid and painful thought, students should attempt to leap to a ready-made knowledge by the help of the last volume of Essays, or of the last article in their favourite religious serial. Of course there are branches of theological study, the literature of which must of necessity be sought elsewhere. Critical knowledge was defective among the older divines through their date, if for no other reason. And the commentators of that time were few and jejune compared with the almost revelation of knowledge which on this subject German criticism has undeniably given to us. Hammond is the main exception in the latter case, and he is almost an exception that proves the rule. Liturgical knowledge, again, is mainly of modern growth amongst us. And exegesis may be said to have found new life, in proportion as men's thoughts have been directed to the literal instead of to allegorical or tropical interpretations. The life-and-death struggles also of more directly immediate theological controversy put in the background, in those days, the deeper and underlying questions respecting the Being and Nature of Almighty God, and the very possibility of

religion, nay, of belief in a Personal God at all, which modern philosophy as well as modern scepticism has now brought uppermost: although much of solid and suggestive remark, even on these topics, may be found in Bramhall's Answers to Hobbes, or in Hooker, and indeed elsewhere also, not to come down to the express work of Archbishop King. But as, on the former class of subjects, undoubtedly we need to supplement our older writers by the school that began with Mill, and now lives in Tregelles and Scrivener and Tischendorf, or again by such really thorough works as those of Bishop Ellicott or Canon Westcott, or doubtless the sounder German commentators also, to name no others here or abroad; so, on the latter, we must look for help to a Delitzsch or a Dörner on the other side of the water and to a Mansel on our own. Yet apart from these, and perhaps some other like points, it remains still the case, that, upon the broad range of theological subjects, we not only have simply no home theology at all except that of our older divines, but there is no other anywhere which surpasses them in thorough honest ability and in manly vigour of thought. I doubt whether any country can produce so goodly a range of able treatises on the great topics of theology.

But the question now is not one of merely educational study. The issue raised is, in effect, whether a certain broad but determinate line of theology, hitherto regarded as that of the Church of this land, shall or shall not be abandoned as no longer tenable. No doubt the divines we are speaking of differ from each other, and differ often each even from himself, in many points. And in Taylor especially are aberrations, not only on minor doctrinal matters, but in very important ones, *e. g.* his notably unsound speculations on original sin. But, taken as a whole, those divines do group themselves together as possessing a common character, common principles, and, in greater matters, a common system of doctrine. It is not meant, of course, that they have always drawn the line of defining, or refusing to define, exactly where they ought, in every point whatever; nor yet that each of a number of independent thinkers, writing too in England, have agreed to a uniformity of statement even on all-important subjects. No doubt the earlier of them maintained episcopacy, for instance, as right in fact, while abstaining, out of regard to foreign Protestants,

from affirming its absolute necessity in principle for all. And while all affirmed a visible Church, yet one or two—*e. g.* notably Taylor in some of his writings—almost explained its scriptural privileges into inutility by referring them too absolutely to the Church invisible. And while some dwelt upon the declaratory power of priestly absolution, meaning thereby to enforce its entire dependence on God's gift and will, others affirmed such absolution to be judicial, meaning thereby only to assert that the priestly office is a real office, and that God's grace goes with the rightful acts of His ministers. In these and other points it is possible to find differences; and yet rather different sides of the same general line of doctrine than views fundamentally contrary to each other. Taken as a whole, there is between them a broad but marked consent, and a clear line of positive statement, in main doctrines, so that we all know what is meant by the old Church divines. The well-known boast of "moderation" and "via media," which is almost their proverbial character, is not a merely negative phrase. It marks a line, adopted upon principle, but which happens to present itself to onlookers as lying between opposite tendencies, such as grow into extremes on either side—the *κάλον* in essence and definition, the *μέσον* only materially and externally,—and a line therefore not to be slighted, as some now slight it, as though it were one of timid and dishonest compromise, which admits enough of principle to confute itself, yet shrinks from bold utterance of that principle honestly held to the uttermost. In matters of theology, indeed, the appearance of such compromise is, in the nature of the case, inevitable. Every heresy almost from the beginning has arisen from the effort to get free from it,—from the logical development of some isolated truth, carried out in a hard and proud spirit, on the plea of honest inference, into its utmost technical results, in disregard of countertruths. Yet, in all subjects above human reason, such countertruths really stand side by side, as in an atmosphere of light, in which the mind's eye is too dazzled to see clearly, and so discerns indeed plainly the existence of the great forms of truth, yet can draw no outline that shall sharply mark out each form one from the other. The "middle path," which refuses so to handle divine mysteries as though it were within its grasp to handle them upon laws of human logic—

which rightly shrinks from the natural temptation to enunciate a seemingly well-compacted theory, or to round off a view by inferences which seem to human reason to be lacking to it, or to devise unauthorised answers to cravings for knowledge which it has not pleased God to gratify by revealing the answers, or to superadd dogmas as shields and safeguards to truths, revealed, but logically (in appearance) incomplete, under the temptation of protecting these truths themselves,—the middle path which thus withstands the Delilah-like temptation of a perfect and compact and neatly beautiful logic, and which knows the boundaries of reason as well as its rightful claims,—is no mere commonplace timidity, to be laughed down by shallow and precipitate innovators. It is the one sober and profound principle, the neglect of which has wrought half of the unsound developments of Romanism, and is largely responsible, as for the magnificent unnaturalness of Calvinism, so even for many of the errors alike of the German rationalists and of our own or American scepticism. So far therefore as the general statement goes,—that on many subjects these divines leave questions open and hold differing views,—as a count of an indictment against them, it merely breaks down and is worthless. They ought to do what they are accused of doing, wherever revealed truth does not lead them by the hand to enable them to do otherwise. The question really is, whether, so far as the English Church has spoken hitherto by their mouths as the accepted expounders of her doctrine, she has gone in any essential point upon false principles, held any important position now demonstrated to be untenable, spoken with a faltering voice where she ought to have defined some essential truth dogmatically, lived upon temporary and fallacious compromises and by principles only half carried out. And does the present crisis demand, as in that case it would, an absolute abandonment of the old ways and the adoption in their stead of a totally new position?

1. Undoubtedly there are some, not unimportant, yet hardly fundamental points, in which the experience of later times, or fuller knowledge, or the legitimate progress of thought, has clearly revealed deficiencies or errors in the school of divines we are considering. First, their theology was too exclusively for the learned. They did not sufficiently lay themselves out for the poor,

and still less for that class between the rich and poor, which knows too little to appreciate deep and refined teaching, yet too much to follow any teaching implicitly. The atmosphere of a learned Church, and of a day when the middle-class was socially nowhere, still hung upon them. They paid but one-half of the "double debt" of the clergy. Baxter's 'Saint's Rest' and Bunyan's 'Pilgrim's Progress' came from other than Church sources. And it is of course a notorious fact that the tradesman class, as a rule, supplied the strength of Puritanism. Now it certainly was not the case that the devout and earnest minded were then to be found only out of the Church, and apart from the special colour of Church ways of thought. Let me refer to Mr. Stoughton's impartial and thoroughly written 'History of the Church of the Civil Wars and of the Commonwealth' for a well-drawn picture of the earnestly devout life that existed within the limits of almost all the religious parties of the time. Yet the peculiar form of devotion which the Church system cultivated was no doubt adapted to refined and educated minds, and was, so far, not adapted to the half-educated. It certainly was not the case, again, that a religious system, maintaining a dogmatic and historical faith,—a visible Church to which men are to be joined,—a divinely-appointed order of clergy,—a doctrine of real sacramental grace,—a belief, in short, in a supernatural system of God's appointment as distinct from a merely natural one of moral instruments and purely outward motives,—that a system of these and kindred doctrines, as such, was (or is) incapable of mastering the affections and wills of practical although only half-taught Englishmen. They who were outside the Church in those times believed in the supernatural, and dogmatized peremptorily, just as much as Churchmen themselves. The Presbyterian then, whatever he may do now, accepted a far more minutely rigorous theory of a divine ministry than that of the Church, and submitted to a far more exacting and interfering and irresponsible spiritual discipline and guidance than ever Episcopal clergy dreamed of. And the Methodist and Wesleyan in later times testified indeed by the grounds of their schism to the existence of a grievous want in the Church, aggravated at the time by the general coldness and irreligion; but the want to which they testified was the defect, not the excessiveness, of individual pastoral guidance. Neither, again, was the cause to be sought in any

objection to the principle of State aid given to the Church. For all sides alike at that time, and the Presbyterians beyond all others, claimed as a right that the civil magistrate should lend his whole civil power to the promotion by the earthly sword of that which each held to be the truth. And the trammels and corruptions that have since arisen incidentally from the connection of the Church with the State, and from the abuse of patronage and the like, and which are and have been the strength of later dissent, are mostly things of later date than the period now spoken of. The failure of the Church to master the whole nation, and notably that growing middle stratum of the nation, must be referred to other causes. (1) The Church of that time did not lay itself out for the people. It sought to gain the ear of the Court and the gentry,* and of those who were then still in the position, although it turned out to be a hollow one, of leaders of the nation, while it did not attempt any large and vigorous efforts to leaven the class below these. The omission, under the circumstances of the time, was not unnatural; but it was fatal. Intervening years have made the evil now, as we all know, both intensified and chronic.† But (2) the clergy of those times were not indeed too learned, but they did not understand how to popularise their learning. They did not, as one of them says, "make a vulgar diet acceptable." It was too commonly the Presbyterian minister who spoke home to the less educated class. The Church preached Christ, but it preached Christ in the language of the school. The Puritan (if we set aside the question of true or false doctrine) preached Christ in the language of the people themselves. And (3) it was the unhappy result of the times

---

* The flattery of dedications, and the fulsome language of divines towards the Court, belong to the time, not to the Church in particular: although Church people ought to have known better. It is a pity that some breath of such a style of language should have crept over the semi-authoritative Preface to James's Bible. Bishop Smith, the Puritan, however, must have the credit of this.

† Nine-tenths of the biographies of Dissenting ministers of the 17th century describe them as beginning their ministry for a small-sounding salary, paid by the corporation of some market-town, or as placed in such a town by some Puritan nobleman: as, *e. g.*, Travers was placed in Warwick. There was certainly much truth in that circle of Nemesis, which Church divines ingeniously worked out: Henry VIII. robbed the Church; Church robbery impoverished the town clergy; an impoverished town clergy gave opportunity and provocation for Puritan market-lecturers; Puritan market-lecturers mainly blew up the flames of the rebellion; the rebellion beheaded Charles I. And so one guilty king's sin came round upon the head of another who was innocent.

that Church views became inextricably mixed up with an unpopular and decaying political creed. And the mistakes and fall of the Stuarts, and the bitter hatred of arbitrary and angrily-wielded civil power—of Star Chambers and Courts of High Commission—redounded to the disadvantage of a form of religious doctrine and discipline which in itself has no connection with them.

2. But yet again, if there is any one lesson read to us in emphatic language by the School of Divinity we are considering, it is this—that compulsion and minute domineering inquisition are no instruments for furthering the acceptance of religious truth, but the surest and most effectual methods of defeating its acceptance. The Tudorish spirit still lingered, in Church as well as State. The very idea of toleration, much more of civil equality, for all creeds and sects, would have been rejected on all sides as simply meaning unbelief. The doctrine of some at the present time, but with an inversion of the apparently intended inference from it, was then all but universal—that punishment of religious falsehood is the necessary and logical complement of belief in religious truth. It must be admitted, then, that the general consent of our older divines would be found on the side of inflicting penalties upon all who, at any rate by open acts, opposed the National Church. Yet let it be remembered (i.) that it was the Bishops of the English Church, who, with only two exceptions, formally counselled Charles I. as his spiritual advisers, that it was lawful for him to tolerate other religious bodies besides the Church, in the sense of not imposing penalties on them. Let it be remembered (ii.) that the one writer who spoke out, and spoke powerfully, for charitable allowance of freedom both in holding and even teaching religious opinions,—who spoke indeed too hastily and unguardedly in that sense,—was the High Church divine, Jeremy Taylor, seconded by a Congregationalist, Goodwin (who risked his own popularity by the act), but answered on behalf of uncompromising persecution by the strong Calvinistic and Presbyterian Rutherford. Let it be remembered (iii.) that in the application of the theory to practice, the Church was not the agent, but the Star Chamber, and an Archbishop only as a member of the Star Chamber; that the persons said to have been punished for religion were almost wholly either promulgators of immoral tenets as well, or, at the

best, factious and virulent libellers; and that the punishments for which Laud is in any sense answerable fell short of death. It was Cromwell and his Parliament who scourged and branded the mad Bristol fanatic in the streets of London. It was the Presbyterians who held Romanists to deserve death as idolaters; and whose discipline, when they were in power, out-Heroded in minute and relentlessly inquisitional tyranny all Church persecutions put together. And it was New England Puritans that scourged Quakeresses, and hung Quakers, and burned witches; not to add their less brutal but not less cruel prohibition of baptism to all whose parents were not of their own sect. No doubt the declaimer against persecution was in each case himself at the time persecuted: although Taylor's biographer has fairly exonerated him, at all events, from the charge of retracting in his prosperity what he had maintained when himself a sufferer. But while it is admitted in general that Church divines (like others) commonly defended what would now be called the principle of persecution, and what, as such, is now abandoned and condemned, it is not to be forgotten that the maintenance of such a principle then is to be charged to the times, while the credit of rising above his time, and of boldly and ably asserting the duty of charity towards religious opponents, in the face of the strongest possible counter opinion, is due above all, and (as regards the weight and the ability of his treatise) almost singly, to the highest of High Churchmen.

3. The older Church theory of the relation of the State to the Church is another subject on which our position as hitherto held may well be thought to demand revision. Church divines, indeed,—as well they might,—protested with a firm and solid resolution against the really infidel view which resolves the Church into a mere function of the State: especially as that view was suicidally carried out by Hobbes's clear and unscrupulous logic, to the conclusion that a subject would be bound to apostatize outwardly, do what he would inwardly, if the king commanded him to do so. They protested against such a less outrageous but equally fatal view as was that of Selden, resolving the whole of the Church's power of excommunication and her entire spiritual power into the gift of the State. They would have protested, no doubt, with equal peremptoriness, had the idea then been broached, against the chimera of a

National (so called) Church, which should hold as its creed the shifting residuum of inert belief wherein the bulk of the nation might from time to time chance to acquiesce. They maintained, on the contrary, the Divine appointment of a corporate Church with a definite dogmatic creed and an Apostolic ministry and spiritual powers derived from God, and not from the State. And, as regards this side of the case, we have need rather to return to their position, than to argue about setting it aside. The limits of spiritual and temporal jurisdiction are clearly and solidly laid down by *e. g.* Bramhall, in theory. And the practice had not then drifted into the abandonment of the Church's discipline, and almost of her doctrine, to a Court of which the majority need not be even Churchmen at all. But on another side the case is otherwise. These divines still held what had been the best face of the Tudor theory. They held that the King had a sort of paternal duty to take care of the religion as well as of the material or moral interests of his subjects, and that he was bound accordingly to recognise, support, and enforce upon them the true and Catholic Church. The King was a Christian, and a Christian must do all he can to spread and strengthen Christianity, and Christianity and the Church were convertible terms. The State then—to put for King the word that belongs to these times—had, in their view, as one of its own proper functions, the office of determining for the subject the form of his creed and Church—it being assumed, of course, that the Church of this land, as reformed after the pattern of the Church Catholic, *was* that form,—and of compelling at least an abstinence from outward opposition to it. State and Church were actually then co-extensive, and it was tempting and natural to assume an identity in theory which really existed in fact. Yet the position is surely not a tenable one. King or State, no doubt all ought to belong to the true and Catholic Church. But the conscience of the ruler, be he one or many, cannot rightfully be the measure of the conscience of the subject. And what if the King turns heretic, or the majority of the class which rules the State, or of the State itself, happens to be, or to become, Dissenters? The former contingency actually did produce very unpleasant results in the days of Henry VIII. and the Act of the Six Articles. The latter is not now so utterly impossible as a result perhaps of not distant days, and it

would upset the theory effectually by the summary argument of facts, if ever it did come to pass. And surely the principle itself is an overstrained one. It is no more the duty of the statesman as such to teach Christianity than it is of an officer of the army in that capacity to do so. The State is God's instrument for one purpose, the Church for another; and it is simply a mischief to set either to do the other's work. The State *ought* to be Christian, and therefore it *ought* to recognise the Church Catholic as its own Church. And in any case it is bound to give to the Church as to others both fair play and freedom.* But here the functions of the State end. It is, indeed, a blessing, far too great to be lightly sacrificed, that the nation as a nation recognises and holds to the Church here set up among us—a blessing to the State more than to the Church, yet in many points, no doubt, a blessing to both. But such recognition must be the free act of the nation itself, to which no civil governor or governing body has the right to coerce it. And in this point then it must be freely admitted that the Caroline divines—although the error, it must be owned, was a very tempting one, in their position—clung to a fallacious support in the zeal of Stuart Kings—clung indeed, in historical fact, to a broken reed which pierced the hand that leaned upon it.

But to pass from these external points to questions of a more vital kind, which affect our doctrinal position. Are we indeed here too to learn another language than that of our great doctors hitherto? and to take up a totally new position in respect to essential matters affecting the faith itself? A new attitude towards the State, and larger and less traditional methods of dealing with the people, are unavoidable and are right. And the Church as a body is slowly learning them. And if I abstain from adding to these a changed attitude towards Dissenters (rather than towards Dissent), it is only because that change has come already, and more than come; and it is the Church, not

---

* "Establishment" really means with us at this moment, simply, that bishops are appointed by the Crown and sit in the House of Lords, and that the Privy Council, instead of the ordinary Judges, deals with Church cases, and that the Church can alter nothing without an Act of Parliament. It means also, unhappily, in the minds of too many, what it does not and ought not to mean, viz., the Church's right to her own endowments. In all respects but those first named, with the addition of some kind of formal and unmeaning national recognition, Dissenters are as much "established" as the Church. The law is supreme over them and protects them to precisely the same extent.

Dissent, that has now to struggle to retain what is rightfully her own. But what of doctrine? and of the rule of faith?

Now any fears upon these points arise, I think, almost wholly in reference to the first and third schools of thought above indicated. Whatever distrust exists towards Church theology in England, does not find its strength in any serious theological assaults upon the special teaching of that theology, so much as (1) in a general unsettlement of belief either in supernatural doctrine or in authoritative dogma as such; or (2) in a recoil from the extreme views of those who apparently seek to overthrow the Reformation settlement altogether. And a few words, therefore, upon these two lines of objection are all that space will here permit.

1. Modern criticism, for instance, has made some way towards what it calls "disintegrating" the Bible. It has brought out, at all events, in very strong relief, what no one ever ought to have doubted or overlooked, the not altogether unnatural or previously unknown fact, that the books of the New Testament did not drop from heaven, but were written by particular men under certain actual phases of opinion and society, and under certain historical conditions; and accordingly belong (so to say) to the circumstantial specialities under which they were written, and are to be interpreted with reference to these; and moreover were written at considerable intervals of time, and came but slowly, as a whole, to the knowledge and acceptance of the entire Church. It has also overthrown some few current interpretations of physical facts as mentioned in the Old Testament. But, on the other hand, not only has it called forth such unanswerable defences of the principle of miracles, as, *e.g.*, Mr. Mozley's Bampton Lectures; but the one real result of rationalistic inquiry into the New Testament, even including M. Rénan himself, seems simply to have issued in proving more strongly than ever the history of our Lord as Christians relate it. And grant the facts—grant even only St. John's Gospel with M. Rénan—and any other than the Christian interpretation is absolutely untenable. And if the Divine authority of Christ be once admitted, then the difficulties in the way of accepting a formal revelation, and supernatural facts and gifts, and inspired writings, simply drop to the ground. The idea, indeed, of a book containing God's revelation *ab initio*, and in such a way as that any man,

no matter who or where or when, can make out, or is intended to make out, from that book alone, the full and exact nature of revealed truth—the textual fashion of using the Bible, which took words apart from their context and put them together in a kind of mosaic to prove doctrines to which they really had no reference—the exegesis of the Bible which did not bear in mind before all else the time and circumstances of the particular words to be expounded—these, and the like, are doubtless, in the face of modern criticism, perfectly out of sight. And even much of the language and many of the arguments, not of mere popular religionism, but of scholars and divines, *e. g.* of Taylor, can scarcely be still maintained. But the authority of the Bible remains untouched nevertheless, if only it be reasonably stated. It certainly cannot be argued without qualification, as Taylor does argue, that God designed to convey all essential Gospel truths to men by Scripture, and therefore that Scripture must needs contain all essential Gospel truths. Neither can it be said fairly, or taken as historically true, that the words of Scripture answer (as Laud says) to the "prime principles" of human science, if it be meant that it either is or ever was the office of the Church, or of individual Christians, historically speaking, to draw out a system of truth from a book which makes no pretensions itself to contain such a system. The words of the New Testament certainly do not formally lay down in complete and orderly array the cycle of the fundamental truths of revelation, out of which the human reason of the Church, guided by the Holy Spirit, was to build up by inferences a complete system of truth. And that system of truth, so far as it was revealed systematically at all, was undoubtedly revealed before the New Testament was written. But it still remains unshakenly true, as a statement of the present rule of faith, that the words of the New Testament are the only inspired Christian words remaining to us, and that they have been only the more solidly proved to be in simple truth what they profess to be—that they alone can guarantee to us with exactness and certainty that this or that doctrine was part of the Apostolic teaching—that in this sense they are to us as "prime principles," as alone bringing us face to face with the actual words that God guided inspired Christian teachers to write;—and that although (as Taylor expressly allows) any doctrine proved on really good grounds to have come from the

Apostles must necessarily be received, whether in Scripture or not, yet there is no such proof and there is no such doctrine. And once grant the New Testament, and all else is implied. As far then as we may venture to reason of the purposes of God, we may at least say thus much—that the means we have, whatever they are, for knowing essential Gospel truth, must needs be sufficient; and therefore no doubt that the evidence of the New Testament, taken to be what the New Testament actually was, and read by the light of the actual history of the several books of the New Testament, *i. e.*, by the now thoroughly sifted testimony of the Primitive Church, must needs contain both the teaching of inspired men, and all that we need know of that teaching. And this is in substance the English Church view as these divines maintain it.

The Laudian view of the Rule of Faith has also been impeached as inconsistent upon another ground, viz. as demanding submission to the National Church, while condemning some, at any rate, of the Conciliar determinations of the Church Universal*—*i. e.* as striving at once to admit, while compelled in other cases to reject, the principle of Church authority, and that in such a way as to refuse the greater degree of such authority while asserting the less. Surely no representation can be more unfair. The Reformation settlement of the Church of England, pending any determinations of the present Church Universal, rested on the ground of setting aside later dogmas or practices of part of the Church, on the authority of the early dogmas and practices of the primitive and still united Church, and of these early dogmas and practices as traced back, until guaranteed to us by Scripture to be Apostolic. It professed further to be willing to submit, so far as it ought, to any real, free, and fair determination of the Universal Church. Now, undoubtedly, in maintaining this position, the Caroline divines plainly deny the formal infallibility of the Present Church, allowing only this qualification—that it is morally impossible for the whole Church militant to fall away in fundamentals. Much more do they deny the formal infallibility of that which is only a representation, more or less adequate, of the present Church, viz. a General

---

* It is the objection of Eastern Church divines. It is alleged, of course, by Roman Catholic controversialists, and in other quarters also at home, of very opposite views to each other.

Council. Scripture, interpreted with due regard to the authority and testimony of the early Church, is in their judgment the one only infallible authority. They assert also, and cite Bellarmine himself as a witness to it, that even "inferiors" may "judge whether their superiors do proceed lawfully or not," —in other words, that a national Church may, or rather in such a case must, judge for itself of the determinations of the present Church at large—"if it manifestly appear that an intolerable error be committed." They do not therefore put the less above the greater authority. They simply maintain, that (assuming of course the moral conditions of a right judgment) when two authorities are in collision, men must and ought to correct for themselves, not the greater by the less, but the less by the greater, viz. the present Church by that which is far above it, by the early and primitive Church as built upon the written Word of God Himself. Undoubtedly they did not hold present Church authority, even in its highest form, to be absolute, immediate, peremptory, excluding all use of reason. Much less did they attribute such an oracular authority to any part of the Church or to any synod of provincial Bishops. They defended the positions of the Church of England, not on the authority of a little isolated Church, setting itself up against the world, but as the positions of the Church Catholic of primitive times, to which this little National Church, like all others, was bound to return, as to truth itself. And if the question is asked,—Who is to determine whether the English Church or that of Rome was right in asserting or denying that these were really the positions of the primitive Church?—the one only appeal possible, in the nature of things, is to the plain lessons of Church history as carried back to the very words of inspiration in the Bible itself. The English Church does not say, "We here, in this corner of the world, in our own judgment, do not think such and such things to be in Scripture:" but, "We here do plainly see that such and such things were not found in Scripture or held to be Apostolic by the early Church, and our own inability so to find them (interpreting Scripture broadly and reasonably) is thus confirmed by a far greater authority than that of the present Church, much more than that of the Church of Rome, which is but one part of it, viz. by the general consent of the undivided, uncorrupted, and primitive Church herself. And the

facts on which this statement is based, stand palpably on the face of history, so that all who run may read." Certainly it is hard to see why we now are to surrender this plain ground, and either to abandon Church authority within its rightful limits because Rome has abused it, or to prefer the authority of the present Church of Rome to that of the Primitive Church; especially at a time when, beyond the experience of the 16th and 17th centuries, the authority of Rome is being burdened more and more with errors that can only be called "intolerable."

2. But to pass from the general principle of all doctrine to particular points of the faith, although here it will be possible to notice only the two or three of those points which are now uppermost in men's thoughts; for lack of space, if for no other reason. And let it be said in the outset, that it affords some fair general presumption of the honesty with which the English Church applied her principle of Scripture interpreted by Catholic consent, that when the Nonjuring Secession set free a body of decidedly High Churchmen, who were thoroughly learned divines besides, the sole changes which the extremer section of that body desiderated, were the four "Usages" (so called), viz. the Prayer of Invocation in the Eucharistic Service, the position in that service of the Prayer of Oblation, the mixing of water with the wine, Prayer for the Dead in public service: points at any rate not of primary importance, and actually decided by the English Church, in her present settlement, not upon the merits but upon grounds of expediency, as having been mixed up incidentally with errors really important; but which in any case form, by the very scantiness and nature of the list, a notable instance of exceptions which prove a rule.

But the course of opinion now tends towards a recurrence, not only to ritual practices like these, but to doctrines of a more important kind, which our older theology deliberately discarded as erroneous. The dead inert state of belief, which some years back reduced the Holy Eucharist in men's thoughts to little more than a specially pious act, has given way to, and helped to bring about, a reaction in the opposite direction. And there is, as we all know, one active body of men now, who would put aside our older theology, and revert to positions respecting the Eucharist which, beyond a doubt, have not been those of this Church for 300 years, and which are distinctly beyond those

of the most advanced of our older Church divines. Undoubtedly, the denial of any real gift in the Eucharist at all is not only the worse error of the two, but is unhappily also the most widely spread among us. But that denial mainly draws its strength, as from the general unbelief in the supernatural, so, with the more religiously minded, from the very excess of the present reaction against it. Nothing has more effectually checked the revival of belief in the Real Presence in its true sense, than the extreme language and the equally extreme practices, that have sprung up recently and spread so widely among us. Now, the real origin and fountain of these excesses appears, if I may humbly say so, to arise from a mode of reasoning about divine truth, false and dangerous in itself, although not without a good side which calls for respectful treatment. It seems to be argued, that a Real Presence cannot exist in the soul, unless there be also previously a Real Presence literally within the elements; that a Real Presence of a Body within the elements cannot exist, unless the manner of that Presence be bodily;* and that a Bodily Presence carries with it by necessity certain practical results, as, for instance, Adoration, which to reject is to deny the Presence altogether. And so men reason backwards, on a subject which reason has no powers to grasp; and, on the strength of a misapplied logic, assume a whole chain of results to be so bound up with the primary and most certain truth from which they start, as that the former and the latter must stand or fall together. Accordingly it comes to pass, that the fundamental doctrine of a real gift conveyed by the Sacrament is held forth to the world as involving inferences that are plainly indefensible; as, for instance, the Adoration of Christ as within the elements, the partaking by the wicked, not of the signs only, but of that which the signs are held literally to enclose, the continuance of the changed nature of the elements *extra usum Sacramenti*, and, indeed, so long as their natural substance continues, the literal offering anew, at each celebration of the Eucharist, of

---

* "What is the meaning of a *corporal* presence being denied, when the *Body* of Christ is said to be verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful, I do not exactly see; for if it is the *Body*, it would of necessity seem to be *corporal;* and if any real and essential presence at all, then I do not understand how it can be otherwise than corporal. And as to *natural flesh and blood*, of course the idea is too absurd. No Christian ever entertained such a notion."—*Conversations on the Prayer-Book*, p. 324, edited by the Rev. W. J. E. Bennett.

Christ Himself, although, of course, in a manner differing from that of the Sacrifice of the Cross. And it is a doctrine tending in various degrees towards this, which we are now called upon to surrender our whole past theological history in order to accept. Now, it is not the place here to discuss Eucharistic doctrine at large. But it is plain—and this is now our business—that our older divines, while maintaining firmly the dependence of the Sacramental Presence upon due consecration, *i.e.*, upon God's promise and power through the instrumentality of His ministers, and the real conveyance of the special gift of the Eucharist by participation of the elements so consecrated, and a change, accordingly, in "the condition, use, and office" of the elements wrought by consecration; nay, a change that *might* indeed be, man knows not what, so only that it be not so explained as to contradict other truths (for the mode of the change is not revealed; and, grant the real conveyance of the gift, "all dispute about the manner of it in the nature of the formal cause may be superseded"),—while they firmly maintained, too, a commemorative sacrifice in the Eucharist,—yet as firmly denied any local and material presence within the elements, and not in order to participation, such as would justify the inferences which a literally material presence involves. From Waterland, at the one end, who talks meagrely of "a relative holiness" as consequent upon consecration, to (say) Johnson, at the other, who alleges the consecrated elements to be "the true spiritual Body and Blood, not in substance but in power and effect," or (stronger still) Bishop Andrewes, who, after Theodoret and Gelasius, adduces the analogy of the Hypostatical Union of Two Natures in Christ to confute Transubstantiation, yet goes no further positively than to a "true fruition of a true Body:"—all agreed in at least this denial. While even including Waterland himself, the *consensus* of our divines would, on the other hand, maintain affirmatively, that the consecrated elements are mystically the Body and the Blood in such sense that they may be called so, as our Lord Himself does so call them; that they are so, therefore, in some peculiar and mysterious way; but that the mode in which they are so is beyond human reason to conceive, save that (1), it cannot be physical and material, and (2) it must be solely in order to participation. The question now raised seems to be, whether we must not go

beyond this, and in order to secure a real Presence at all anywhere, affirm a material Presence within the consecrated elements. The ultra school among us now certainly maintains inferences, some more, some less, which such a principle alone can justify (as, indeed, it necessitates them); while one of that school, at any rate, asserts, *eo nomine*, Transubstantiation itself. The motive, no doubt, which underlies their zealous advocacy of such views, is, let it be freely owned, the assumption that there is no logical standing-ground between their teaching and the denial of a Real Presence altogether. And if this were so, their case would be a strong one. But in order to this, they must assume, that unless the sacramental gifts "physically inhere" in the elements without reference to participation, then those sacramental gifts cannot be given by and with the elements—a position which surely needs no refutation beyond the bare statement of it. If, indeed, the word "objective," which they press upon us, means only what its original introducer intended by it, viz., that the Presence comes from the act of God without us, and not from our own mental state, undoubtedly it is not only innocent but indicates an essential truth. But then a spiritual Presence, by power and effect, is equally "objective" in this sense with a material one. And a theory of the Presence that is to afford a basis for the inferences above noted must be not only objective but material. I prefer to answer those who maintain the necessity of such a material theory, in the words of the late Archdeacon Wilberforce; who tells us, and tells us most soundly and truly, that "the consecrated elements, even if they undergo a material change, have no more tendency than without such change, to produce the real ends which result from Sacraments;" and further still, "that to rest upon such a change is incompatible with a reference to our Lord's Ascended Manhood, as that Head of the renewed race with whom it is the purpose of Sacraments to unite us." And again, he tells us, and with undoubted truth, that "material consumption" is wholly irrelevant to "spiritual efficacy." In a word, then, the view for which we are to stultify the whole past of the English Church, is a gratuitous view, as meeting no difficulty and answering no purpose; it is a view based mainly upon logical inferences unduly pressed; and it is a view inconsistent with the cardinal doctrine of the Ascension.

3. There is yet another doctrine upon which present tendencies swerve by a decided line from those of the *consensus* of English divines hitherto. And they depart from it apparently upon the same dangerous principle of what may be called protective development. A doctrine seems to human reason to need some yet further statement, in order to shield it from attack, or as seeming to man's reason to be implied in it, or as requiring it in order to be rounded off into logical completeness. And reason goes beyond revelation in order to supply this further statement. Men are tempted, like Uzzah, out of no worse motive, it may be, than an anxious care for the stability of the ark of truth, to put forth rash and unbidden hands, as they think, to steady it. The Incarnation, for instance, must needs necessitate a belief in the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin; so that to deny the latter will lead in time to at least an obscuring of the former: as though the very same reasoning, if it were worth anything in her case, of whom no such thing is either read in Scripture or held by antiquity, would not involve of necessity the extension of a like inference to all who had preceded her in the privilege of holding a place in the earthly genealogy of our Lord. Just as, in that utterly fearful parallel which is referred to by Dr. Pusey,* the Blood of the Atonement, as in the Eucharist, is alleged by some in other lands to contain, by like reason of descent, the blood of her who was honoured to be the earthly parent of the Saviour; and if so, must needs, by parity of reasoning (if such reasoning be once admitted at all), go backwards and upwards also to include all who are in the same honoured list. And yet, because Englishmen have sometimes spoken less reverently than they ought of her who was blessed above women, we are now called upon†—in the face of the terrible and ever-growing blight of deadly error on the subject which possesses the Roman Communion—to hold our belief in the Athanasian Creed and in the Immaculate Conception to rest upon like principles, and to stand or fall one with the other. Antiquity speaks of the Mother of our Lord as of an instrument towards our redemption in terms which then were on this ground

---

* 'Eirenicon,' Part II.

† As in the Essay prefixed to the recent republication of Anthony Stafford's 'Femall (sic) Glory.'

justifiable, but which, since later abuse of them, would be dangerous. And piety bids us speak with humility and reverence of one so unspeakably honoured. Yet, even in the way of reverence, the language of such as Andrewes is the utmost to which pious belief can reach, who simply "remembers" her "with all saints;" and this, as "blessed above all"—so says Scripture; and as "Mother of God"—so affirms the analogy of faith—and then further, as antiquity firmly believed, as "pure" and "Ever-Virgin." One can but pray to God that in this matter, too, He may be pleased to preserve His Church in this land from even the beginning of that deadly evil which eats like a plague into the very heart of other Churches.

4. Take, yet once more, our relations to the Papacy. And here, again, there is with many a desire to abandon our old position. No Christian man, indeed, but must long for reunion between the severed limbs of what ought to be the One mystical Body of Christ. No Christian man but must feel that the state of separation is *primâ facie* a wrong, and in any case and to both sides a painfully mischievous, state. No man but ought to shrink from any needless word that may intensify the evil, or any teaching that may either, without strong cause, widen the breach, or may represent it as wider than it really is. Doubtless also there has been on our own part in past times too much of a self-complacent insular tone of self-satisfied condemnation of others And on these grounds it is a thought of comfort that the desire of reunion now comes mainly from our own side, and that it is not we who peremptorily and self-complacently reject all union as impossible, save upon terms of abject submission.

But truth must come before peace. And I fear the words that were true when Bramhall wrote have only gathered additional strength as time has gone on. Whilst Rome "imposes upon us daily new articles of faith, and urges rigidly what she has unadvisedly determined, we dare not sacrifice truth to peace, nor be separated from the Gospel to be joined to Rome." It may be, indeed, very true that much of the Tridentine decrees has grown out of one side of the true doctrine—over-stated, or distorted for want of its counterpart in other truths. It is true also—and our own divines, at least, ever admitted it—that special views on both sides have often grown out of verbal differences, or varying modes of stating views essentially one,

and that by tracing the original of such controversies, a mode may often be found out for soundly and rightly reconciling them; that "many questions are logomachies, and many, scholastical disputes;" and that the first step, at least, towards reunion must be to know how far we really differ. Yet it is hard to see how statements which in themselves are *ex hypothesi* doctrinally wrong can be made right, without change or correction, by a superadded gloss. And it is still harder to imagine a solid, and hearty, and loyal union on the basis of a patchwork, or of statements only conventionally accepted as bridging over difficulties without removing them. And although, again, we may not blink our own faults, or assume to ourselves (as Rome does) a monopoly of infallibility, yet neither is it right to abdicate our own conscientious convictions—resting as they do upon experience and history, and the Bible itself—in favour of the arbitrary judgment of men, who are simply, in our honest judgment, (like ourselves) a part—and that, too, a corrupt part—of the present Church, and no more. And, further, although it may be that the over-wrought tension of the present Roman Communion may break—God only knows—yet the front which she presents at this moment makes reunion with her now only more utterly impossible than ever it was before. If "reducing the Creed to what it was in the time of the first four Councils and reducing the Bishop of Rome from his monarchy to a principality of order, and reforming Divine offices,"* which are the terms—and the only terms—wherewith our own principles, and the law of truth, and the mere hope of a solid reunion, would allow us to be content—if these, I say, were difficult even to hope for in the time of Bramhall, subsequent acts of the Roman Church have, alas! made them now an impossible dream. Meanwhile, the manly and the Christian course is surely not to be found in any other line than that which our older divines marked out—willingness to re-unite with those who separated from us, not we from them,—readiness to concede all rightful explanations and all secondary or indifferent points,—but withal a resolute preference of truth first, and then, but then only, peace. "Free Councils and conferences of moderate persons" might, indeed, help to bring us together. But it is a merely

---

* Bramhall, Answ. to La Millet., Works. i. 60.

useless degradation of ourselves to seek for fair judgment at the hands of a Council, which starts with bidding us appear as heretics and criminals; not to discuss terms of union between Churches, but to sue for pardon as though already condemned.

I add only, in conclusion, that if (as it seems) the only way of even hoping to bring about a reunion with other Churches be to revive in our own Church a living belief in her own Divine office and powers, in the reality of her Sacraments, in the Divine authority of her Creeds, in the authority and right office of her ministers, then the surest method of defeating such a result is the revival in her of errors long since rejected, and of practices deliberately laid aside. To be simply like Rome will not satisfy Rome, even could it be right to be like her where she is wrong. And to identify in men's minds the cause of Church authority and of dogmatic belief with Rome as she is, can only disgust and alienate intelligent and honest minds from the truth itself. In this present age they who will preserve faith must needs keep faith unburdened by accretions of error, and free to fight her battle with all the advantages of a good cause and of sound reason. We have held our position now for three centuries. And though it is not the position any Church would choose (for it is a position of isolation, although involuntarily so), yet it is not to be surrendered unadvisedly, or without any other changes in those who have isolated us than such as aggravate the unhappy facts that compelled isolation. And certainly, on the abstract merits of the controversy, reasons have yet to be produced sufficient to set aside the teaching of the old, and manly, and massive school of our great English divines.

ARTHUR WEST HADDAN.

ESSAY VII.

LITURGIES AND RITUAL.

By MICHAEL F. SADLER, M.A.,

Prebendary of Wells, and Rector of Honiton.

CONTENTS OF ESSAY VII.

Question proposed, Is the English rite for the celebration of the Eucharist according to the will of God?
Means of ascertaining His will.
The mystery of the Eucharist stated in connection with the doctrine of the Person of Christ.
Impossibility of simplifying the terms in which the mystery is stated.
The discourse in the Synagogue. Reference to that discourse in the words of Institution.
The mystery adequately set forth in the English rite. No human authority can affect its interpretation.
The use of such a term as "spiritual" solves no difficulty.
The Sacrifice in the Eucharist.
Apostles must have taught much Eucharistic doctrine, and made many regulations respecting the mode of celebrating it.
In the Old Testament the worship of the Christian Church always predicted as sacrificial: sacrificial terms applied to the Eucharist by the earliest Christian writers, as Clement of Rome.
Clement's testimony examined.
Ancient Liturgies contain sacrificial language.
No actual sacrifice in the sense of immolation, or surrender, in the Eucharist.
This difficulty recognised by the Nicene Fathers, by Chrysostom, by Bp. Cosin, by Romanist writers.
The sacrifice in no way depends on the nature or mode of the presence.
The sacrificial character of the Eucharist depends on the proper interpretation of the word *ἀνάμνησις*.
The only sense in which the Eucharist can be regarded as sacrificial.
Memorial in the sight of God rather than of man.
The Eucharist, though without the outward form, has far more of the evangelical reality of sacrifice than any Levitical offering could possess.
In what part of the whole Eucharistic action does the actual sacrifice consist?
Inference from the account of the Institution.
Examination of the sacrificial expressions in the ancient Liturgies.
The Clementine.
The Alexandrian, or St. Mark's.
The Liturgy of St. James, or of Jerusalem.
The Roman.
Double act of sacrifice in the Roman rite—of the Unconsecrated elements in the Ordinary of the Mass, and of the Body and Blood in the Canon.
Confusion of these two throughout the whole rite. The unconsecrated and the consecrated offered in the same terms, and for the same ends.
Reason for this confusion to be found in the attempt to confine the sacrifice to the action of the celebrant alone.
Examination of the English rite.
Agreement of this rite in the matter of sacrifice with the account of the Institution.
The English rite fully recognises all the Scripture aspects of the Eucharist,
And embodies all the leading features of ancient Liturgical worship.
Does not recognise Holy Communion as a means of bringing amongst us Christ as an object of worship.
In this we agree with all the ancient Liturgies.
Witness of Mr. Keble and Dr. Neale to this.
No prayers addressed to Christ as in the bread.
No rubrics directing adoration.
Adoration. Mr. Keble's book. Can he mean more than profound reverence? His premises seem to require larger conclusions.
He supplies us with the true vindication of our own, and of the ancient Offices, in not directing special adoration to Christ under the Bread.
Our Communion Office a new rite. Wrong in principle to attempt to clothe it with all the ritual accessories of the old.
Elevation and Adoration. Lighted Candles. Incense. Mixed Chalice. Vestments.
Conclusion.

LITURGIES AND RITUAL.

We propose, relying on God's help, to consider the question, "Is the Order of the Administration of the Lord's Supper, or Holy Communion, as it is set forth in the Book of Common Prayer, agreeable to the mind and will of the Divine Institutor?" In endeavouring to ascertain His will, we have to look first to His written Word, for that Word contains the original account of the Institution. From this we learn the mystery inherent in the Eucharist—a mystery to which the Church has in reality added nothing, and upon which all her fathers, doctors, synods, and councils have not thrown one ray of light.

All who in any way profess to fulfil the institution of Christ make their primary appeal to the Scriptures—the Romanist as persistently and with as good reason as the ultra-Protestant, for all the difference between the two lies in their respective interpretations of the words of Scripture.

But when we examine the Scriptures, we find that no directions respecting the celebration of the Lord's Supper are to be found in the New Testament. Our Lord, when He instituted the Eucharist, took a part of a Jewish rite, and made it the Sacrament of His Body and Blood; but the particular words or actions which He used in doing this (as, for instance, the words of the "blessing" or "giving of thanks" with which He blessed the bread and the cup,) have not been preserved to us in the narrative.

Again, from the only notice of the celebration which has been transmitted to us in the Apostolical Epistles we learn that the Apostle St. Paul set in order what was needful,* but the particulars of this "setting in order" are not to be found in the apostolic writings.

No Church, or body of Christians, in existence, pretends to find its mode of celebration in the New Testament. The Pres-

---

* 1 Cor. xi. 34.

byterian or the Independent can no more show any direction of Scripture for his mode than the Romanist can show for his; and it is to the last degree unlikely that a service which enshrines such mystery should have been left at the mercy of the individual minister presiding over the congregation at the time of celebration. It is clear that our Lord, by ordaining the reception of outward signs, instituted the Holy Communion as an outward rite as well as an inner mystery of grace, and if so, it must have had some outward form of celebration. Other apostles as well as St. Paul must, in the several Churches which they planted, have left full directions respecting it.

Now, if we find that there existed in all parts of the ancient Christian world a certain well-defined order of Communion Service, which, under every variety of expression, always retained the same leading features, generally arranged in the same order; and if this ancient mode of celebrating can be traced to times long before the rise of any central authority, Papal or Imperial, to compel uniformity, then the conclusion is irresistible that the mode in question must have originated with the Apostles, and it must be taken into account by all who would conform themselves to the will of Christ.

We have first to ascertain for what purpose, or purposes, our Lord instituted the Blessed Eucharist. Three reasons have been assigned.

I. The embodiment of a Mystery.
II. The offering up of a Sacrifice.
III. The bringing amongst us of an Object of worship.

I. The Church has ever regarded the Lord's Supper as her peculiar Mystery. "The Mysteries" was the ancient name for the whole service. In our own service we have, "He hath instituted and ordained Holy Mysteries." "We who have duly received these Holy Mysteries." The greatest intellects have acknowledged the Mystery. Hooker and Calvin have alike confessed it, and desired to leave it where the Scripture has left it.*

---

* Hooker's words are well known; Calvin's are not less remarkable. "If, indeed, it be lawful to put this great mystery into words, a mystery which I feel, and therefore freely confess that I am unable to comprehend with my mind, so far am I from wishing any one to measure its sublimity by my feeble capacity." . . . And again, "To speak more plainly, I rather feel than understand it."

"The Church of England," writes a living prelate of the Liberal school, "has dealt with this subject in a spirit of true reverence, as well as of prudence and charity. She asserts the mystery inherent in the Institution of the Sacrament, but abstains from all attempts to investigate or define it." *

Now, what is this Mystery? It is impossible to state it apart from some reference to the Person of Him Who first enunciated it.

The Mystery, then, may be stated thus. The Only Begotten Son of the Most High took upon Him the whole and perfect nature of His creature, man; so perfectly that in Him dwelt "all the fulness of the Godhead bodily," so that when men saw Him they saw God—when men handled Him they "handled of the Word of Life"—when men crucified Him they "crucified the Lord of Glory."

From the coming amongst us of such an One, so infinitely mysterious in His Person, it was only reasonable to expect supernatural results of the highest order; and so all who believe in Him as the Only Begotten Son of God are agreed that He came amongst us to be the One Mediator between God and the whole sinful race. So astonishing an humiliation of the Divine nature as is involved in the simplest statement of the Incarnation must have been brought about for some adequate end, and this universal Mediatorship between God and the creation seems the only end answering to such means.

This Incarnate Word and Wisdom of God gives utterance to the most startling and enigmatical language that ever fell on mortal ears. With the future of His Church spread out before Him—with a full cognisance of the various ways in which men would accept or reject, apprehend or misapprehend, His words—He sets forth that the highest supernatural and spiritual results of His own Mediation are to be brought about by a method which He Himself studiously expresses in terms which seem to describe a physical process—in language taken from the lower world of matter and sense rather than the higher world of mind and spirit—in words markedly and decisively objective, because describing the outward acts of the body rather than the intuitions of the soul.

---

* Charge of Bishop of St. David's for 1866, p. 97.

No supernatural results of His Mediation go beyond this, that our very bodies should be raised up to the Resurrection of Life; no spiritual results can go beyond this, that we should dwell in Him and He in us; and yet these two results are made by Him to depend not only upon believing in Him, obeying Him, or pleasing Him, but upon eating His Flesh and drinking His Blood.

Before examining whether at all, or how far, these words refer to the reception of the Holy Communion, I would remark that it is impossible to divest these terms of their deep mystery. Let any one attempt to translate them into the language of ordinary spiritual life, by divesting them of what refers to the outward and corporeal, and by interpreting them as a simply spiritual process, and he will be convinced how inadequate any such explanation is to account for the choice of such terms.

Some say that this eating is simply believing; but this is impossible, for the Saviour begins with the spiritual process in the heart, *i. e.* with "believing," and proceeds to this "eating of His flesh" as a something beyond mere "believing." He begins with asserting the saving power of faith in Himself, *i. e.* of course, in His whole Person. "He that believeth on Me hath everlasting life."* Then He goes on to speak of Himself as the "bread of life;" and just at the very point where we should have supposed that He would have explained this eating of Himself to be the exercise of an internal act of faith in His Person, work, or character, He actually proceeds to do the very opposite. Instead of (as men naturally would have expected) studiously avoiding the use of terms which would divert attention from the simple internal act of faith, He asserts the "bread" to be His "Flesh;" and when the Jews stumbled at this, He doubles the difficulty by joining the "drinking of His Blood" to the "eating of His Flesh" (ver. 53).

So that, instead of commencing with the "fleshly," and leading His hearers on to the "spiritual," He does the very opposite. He commences with the spiritual, in that He speaks of believing in Himself, and ends with the more corporeal terms, in that He makes the eating of Himself as the Bread of Life to depend upon "eating His Flesh" and "drinking His Blood."

---

* John vi. 47.

It is equally impossible to interpret these words as if Christ virtually means by them that we must partake of His Spirit, for surely such terms as "flesh" and "spirit" are not interchangeable: They are opposites—more opposite in their significations than fire and water, bitter and sweet, earth and heaven.

How could One Who had the future of His Church before Him express such a term as "spirit" by its very opposite, knowing that the tendency from the first would be to take it as literally as possible? Let us insist as strongly and persistently as we can that there must be an intensely spiritual act implied in the words of Christ, yet there must be something over and above the spiritual act to justify the use of such terms; and in what that "something" is lies the mystery.

Again, it is equally impossible to understand these words of an act of loving remembrance only; for would any one express the cherishing of the memory of a departed friend by such words as "eating his flesh" and "drinking his blood"? To say that these words must be understood in a sacrificial sense, *i.e.* that we must partake of the sacrifice of Christ, is on the side of the mystery, for the very flesh of the things sacrificed was of old actually partaken of. So that the analogy of Jewish or heathen worship points to some mysterious participation in the Body of our atoning Victim.

We have now to consider the connection of the mystery with the Lord's Supper.

The words of the discourse in the Synagogue must have some fulfilment. Some means must be ordained, or some explanations given, by which men may be enabled to eat the Flesh of Christ and to drink His Blood, and so partake of the amazing benefits connected therewith. Our Lord seems to ordain a means of doing so when, on the eve of His lifegiving Death, He "took bread" and "blessed it" and "gave it" to those very persons who had heard the former mysterious words, saying, "Take, eat, this is my body which is given for you;" and He doubles the probability, that He ordains such a means, by taking the cup and similarly identifying it with that Blood which He had said that men must drink. The mystery of the discourse at Capernaum and the Institution of the Eucharist must have some most intimate connection with one another; for the same remarkable terms are common to both,

and these terms are used in no other connection throughout the New Testament. Similar words reappear once in the Pauline Epistles, but then only in connection with the Eucharist.

So that unless the words of Institution are the counterpart of the words in John vi., the most wondrous words uttered even by Christ Himself have nothing corresponding to them throughout the New Testament. They drop to the ground and are utterly lost sight of, for in no single place are the salient words of this discourse [eating the Flesh of the Son of man and drinking His Blood] applied to the realisation, by an internal act of the soul, of the atoning love of Christ. Nowhere is any spiritual manducation of Christ even remotely alluded to. The unutterably mysterious language of John vi. reappears only in the account of the Institution in the Evangelists and in St. Paul's account of the same.

Again, the words used by St. Paul in setting forth Eucharistic benefits require some extraordinary promise of Christ to warrant them, for He speaks of the "cup" and the "bread" being the communion, *i.e.* the participation, of the Blood and Body of Christ, and of our inherence in the one mystical Body of the Lord being brought about by the partaking of the "One Bread."*

Again the fearful words respecting unworthy receiving imply that the benefits attending faithful receiving must be proportionably great. If they who eat and drink unworthily are "guilty of the Body and Blood of the Lord," and eat and drink condemnation to themselves, "not discerning the Lord's Body," they who receive in faith, discerning the Lord's Body, must receive the opposite to condemnation, *i.e.* eternal life, which the Saviour Himself asserts in the discourse to depend upon "eating His Flesh" and "drinking His Blood."

With all this agree such matters as the time of the original Institution, namely, the eve of His Passion; the exceeding great and earnest longing He had to partake of it with His chosen, and the fact that the steadfast continuance in the "breaking of bread" was one of the leading marks of Pentecostal Christianity. All these concur in leading us to believe that it must be the enshrinement of some special mystery of grace.

---

* 1 Cor. x. 16, 17.

It is clear, then, that the Saviour primarily instituted the Eucharist as the means whereby His people are to eat His Flesh and to drink His Blood. His first object must be ours, and we humbly trust that in the form of service which we have inherited, this first intention of our Master is fulfilled.

Now, in our Service the effect of faithful receiving is set forth to be that "we dwell in Christ and Christ in us, we are one with Christ and Christ with us," and this grounded on the promise of Christ, "He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me and I in him." What in this address we are led to expect, in the "Prayer of humble access" we pray for. "Grant us therefore, gracious Lord, so to eat the flesh of Thy dear Son, Jesus Christ, and to drink His blood . . . . that we may evermore dwell in Him and He in us." Here is a very distinct recognition of the Communion as the means of realising the mystery. A recognition far more distinct than in any Ancient Liturgy which has come down to us.* There is nothing approaching to it in the Canon of the Mass. Throughout the Romish service there is no reference to the blessed effects set forth in our Lord's discourse in Capernaum as connected with the eating of His Flesh. These benefits are by the Saviour Himself set forth as pertaining to both body and soul. "Whoso eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood hath eternal life, and I will raise him up at the last day." The truth which these words connect with the right reception of Christ's Flesh and Blood is not to be found in the Canon of the Mass. There is not one word throughout that service connecting the reception of the Body and Blood of Christ with the Resurrection of the body such as there is with us in the words, "The Body of our Lord Jesus Christ which was given for thee, preserve thy *body* and soul unto everlasting life." The benefits set forth in the discourse at Capernaum extend to the whole person of the believer. The recognition of the part which the body has in the promise of Christ is in the Canon of the Mass the faintest possible, "May it be to me a safeguard and remedy both of body and soul." The words in the Canon in which the priest

---

* Except, perhaps, in the Liturgies of the Edessene family. In one of these, the Malabar, of which a translation has been published by Dr. Neale, we have the words "Whosoever approacheth in love, and receiveth Me, shall dwell in Me for ever" (p. 151).

communicates the people, make no mention (as the corresponding words in our service do) of the body; they are, "May the body of our Lord Jesus Christ preserve thy soul to life everlasting."

Again, if Christ be in us and we in Him, we are members of His mystical body. This is the great Eucharistic truth taught us in the words of St. Paul, "We, being many, are one bread and one body, for we are all partakers of that one bread." For this (which is not even alluded to in the Canon of the Mass) we give distinct thanks to God in the words, "We most heartily thank thee that thou dost assure us thereby . . . . that we are very members incorporate in the mystical body of Thy Son."

The benefits connected by the Lord and His Apostle with the reception of His Body and Blood are recognised in our Liturgy more distinctly than they are (I believe) in any other Liturgy which has been, or is, in use in any branch of the Catholic Church.

It is equally clearly recognised that we partake of these benefits, not by an internal and wholly subjective act of faith, but by faith energized in an outward and visible act of reception of what has been consecrated by the recitation of the words of Christ, and by a minister of that organization which He has Himself founded. For, in the first place, we are invited to what is called "The most comfortable Sacrament of the body and blood of Christ," and are told that "God hath given His Son our Saviour Jesus Christ, not only to die for us, but to be our spiritual food and sustenance in that Holy Sacrament, . . . so Divine and comfortable a thing to those who receive it worthily."

Again, those who are about to partake are addressed as "Those who mind to come to the Holy Communion of the Body and Blood of Christ." In the "Prayer of humble access," immediately before Consecration, we pray that "We may so eat the flesh of Christ and drink His blood," &c.

In the Prayer of Consecration, the priest beseeches God that we, "receiving God's creatures of bread and wine, according to His Son our Saviour Jesus Christ's Holy Institution . . . . may be partakers of His most Blessed Body and Blood." Whilst laying his hands upon the elements, he repeats the words of Christ, "This is my Body which is given for you," and the bread is delivered to each communicant with the words, "The Body of our Lord Jesus Christ which was given for thee, preserve thy

body and soul unto everlasting life;" and, lastly, we thank God that He hath vouchsafed "to feed us, who have duly received these holy mysteries, with the spiritual food of the most precious Body and Blood of our Saviour Jesus Christ."

Thus does our Liturgy recognise the Divine Mystery of the eating of the Flesh of Christ, and the divinely ordained means by which we are enabled so to do, the benefits pertaining to our whole nature on our eating of the Bread of Life, the attainment of them through the reception of the Flesh and Blood of Christ, as distinguished from, though not apart from, His Mind or Spirit. All this is set forth in the Service as it is in the Holy Scriptures.

One word on the foregoing.

It seems to me exceedingly futile to attempt to interpret this Service by appeals to the opinions of those who composed it out of more ancient forms, or of those who, in later times, revised it.

For THE words which distinguish the Service, with the mystery inherent in them, and the benefits set forth by them, are the words of Christ Himself.

There can be no doubt that (to use familiar party terms) there was a higher, or more sacramental service in 1549, and a lower in 1552, and of this latter the Church or sacramental tone has been much raised or intensified by succeeding revisions; but, after all, the awfully mysterious words which the Service retains are the very words of Christ, and the Secret which they contain is His Secret, so that if we would be conformed to His will, we must determine to mean by them what He means—nothing short of it; and, if such a thing be possible, nothing beyond it.

As long as the very words of Christ are retained, it is impossible to interpret them so as to divest them of their mystery.

In our Service there is one word not to be found in Scripture in connection with the words of Institution. I allude, of course, to the word "Spiritual." "The *spiritual* food of the most precious body and blood." "Then we *spiritually* eat the flesh of Christ and drink His blood."

Now this word was, no doubt, added in order to correct gross and carnal conceptions: but see how, instead of solving the mystery, it in reality enhances it, by bringing out more vividly the difference between the words of the Institution, and the

words describing ordinary spiritual acts—for what mean we by "spiritually" eating "flesh," or by being fed with the "spiritual" food of a "body"? *

II. The second reason assigned for the Institution of the Eucharist is that in it we should perform an act of sacrificial worship.

All Churches or bodies of Christians have, with one consent, connected the celebration of the Lord's Supper with acts of thanksgiving and praise. The earliest forms of Christian worship are all Communion offices, containing certain definite acts of praise and prayer which, whilst differing, more or less, in their language, are still substantially the same, and what is still more remarkable, appear almost always in the same order in different liturgies. In all these liturgies, without exception, sacrificial language is applied to the celebration. In the New Testament

---

* I cannot forbear giving some extracts from some articles on the Lord's Supper, written by one of the leading Congregationalist ministers of the present day. They confirm so strongly the fact, that a thinking mind, retaining its faith in the *bonâ fide* nature of the Revelation of God's will in the New Testament, cannot but regard Eucharistic truth otherwise than as essentially mysterious.

"The strong expressions about eating the Flesh and drinking the Blood of the Son of Man are very commonly interpreted as though they meant nothing more than believing what Christ taught. If this is all they mean, then it is difficult to understand why Our Lord should have used such expressions at all. His subsequent explanation to the disciples of His 'hard saying,' does not satisfy me that language so startling was meant to convey a truth so obvious and simple. . . . . . They would brood over His strange words, wondering what their full meaning was. By and by they came to understand them. In the Lord's Supper we have the development of the truths which the Apostles could not apprehend when they were first revealed. We have these truths developed, I say, in the Lord's Supper. It is, however, very doubtful whether it is possible to exhaust in definite propositions the meaning of the Ordinance. . . . The ceremony is not a mere artificial aid to memory, assisting to perpetuate certain abstract or historical truths which might as well be written in a book; it is intended to convey, and does actually convey, more than mere words can express. To explain therefore what Christ means by making the bread the symbol of the body, and commanding His disciples to eat it, seems to me not merely difficult, but impossible. . . . The bread is the body of Christ; and no familiarity with theological speculation is required to suggest to the mind of every communicant that our Lord intended to connect the higher life, which He originates and sustains, with His humanity. As the bread itself is the natural symbol of all that supports our physical life, so the body is the natural symbol of human nature. It is impossible to resist the conviction that Christ meant to say that He is the life of man because He Himself has become man. We live by Him, not because He is God simply, but because He is God manifest in the flesh."—Rev. R. W. Dale on the Lord's Supper, in 'Evangelical Magazine' for 1867, pp. 302–304.

Of course, in reading the above, one desiderates that the mystery should have been rather recognised as pertaining to what is *given* than to what is *taught*, but such teaching is a great advance upon what is held even by Evangelicals in the Church of England.

there is no direction whatsoever respecting the mode in which the Lord's Supper is to be celebrated, just as there is no direction whatsoever for the conduct of Divine service of any sort. We are told incidentally that the Christians of a certain place assembled on the Lord's day to "break bread,"* and that the Apostles observed the hours of prayer;† but there is no distinct Apostolic precept for either the one or the other.

Were, then, the Apostolic Christians without any regulations respecting Divine Service? Assuredly not. The Christian Church was established and flourished long before any book of the New Testament was written. The Apostolic Epistles bear ample witness to the fact that the Churches had been previously grounded in doctrinal or dogmatic truth, and had Apostolically ordained regulations or traditions. There is very much in the Epistles of St. Paul, which implies that his converts were in possession of a definite creed of Divine truth and definite ordinances. St. Timothy is told to "hold fast a form of sound words," and to "keep a deposit, or good thing, committed to him," which form, or deposit, however, is not definitely stated in any book of the New Testament. Twice does the Apostle make mention of "ordinances," or "traditions," which the Churches had received from him. First, when he writes to the Corinthians, "Ye keep the ordinances (*παραδόσεις*) as I delivered them unto you" (1 Cor. xi. 2). Again, where he writes, "Stand fast, and hold the traditions (*παραδόσεις*) which ye have been taught, whether by word or our Epistle" (2 Thess. ii. 15).

The Apostolical Epistles, then, bear ample witness to the fact that they were addressed to communities already instructed in the doctrines of Christ, and possessing ordinances or traditions. Some of these were upon the Lord's Supper (1 Cor. xi. 34). There must have been much teaching respecting that "Bread," which when blessed was the "communion of the Body of Christ," which assured the devout partakers that they were "one body in Christ,"‡ and which was so fearful a thing if received unworthily; but all that we learn of it from St. Paul comes in incidentally. There had been temptations in the Corinthian Church to eat things offered to idols, and certain disorders attending the celebration, and these gave occasion to the Apostle to

---

* Acts xx. 7. † Acts iii. 1, x. 9. ‡ 1 Cor. x. 17.

recount over again what he had "received of the Lord," and had *before* "delivered unto them;" and he could hardly have delivered it at the first without giving the doctrinal signification; but all this would have been lost to the Church (humanly speaking), unless certain disorders had arisen which required his correction, which correction we have in his first Epistle to the Corinthian Church.

Two matters now require to be noticed.

1. In the Jewish Prophets the worship of the times of the Messiah is (I believe invariably) prophesied of as being sacrificial.

Jeremiah speaks of God's covenant with "the Branch of Righteousness," the Spiritual David, and in his time sacrificial worship is supposed to be offered to God. "Thus saith the Lord, David shall never want a man to sit upon the throne of the house of Israel. Neither shall the Priests the Levites want a man before me to offer burnt-offerings, and to kindle meat-offerings, and to do sacrifice continually" (Jer. xxxiii. 17, 18).

Again, Isaiah, evidently predicting the state of things in the kingdom of Christ, prophesies thus:—"Also the sons of the stranger that join themselves to the Lord . . . them will I bring to my holy mountain, and make them joyful in my house of prayer: their burnt-offerings and their sacrifices shall be accepted upon mine altar; for mine house shall be called an house of prayer for all people" (Isa. lvi. 6, 7).

Again, at the close of the Prophecy of Ezekiel, there is a vision of the living waters of the Gospel, and yet, synchronous with this, we find visions of strictly sacrificial worship (Ez. xlv., xlvi., xlvii.).

Again, in the close of the Prophecy of Zechariah, we have a prophecy of all nations coming up to Jerusalem to offer worship described as sacrificial.

And, lastly, Malachi contrasts the pure worship of the fast-approaching Messianic kingdom with the polluted worship offered by the priests of his own time: here, then, it might have been expected that he would have avoided all references to material sacrifices, and described the worship of the times of Christ in purely spiritual terms; but, instead of this, he speaks of the Lord Who comes to His temple "purifying the sons of Levi that they may offer to the Lord an offering in righteousness," and that "God's name should be great among the Gentiles, and in

every place incense and a pure offering (Minchah) should be offered unto Him." Now these sacrifices, thus prophetically described, cannot mean merely the offerings of pure hearts and fervent prayers, for such offerings were no new things, but were fully recognised as needful by all the Old Testament prophets; so that to have described the future worship under such markedly sacrificial images, when nothing more was meant than a purely spiritual service, would have been simply misleading.

2. A second matter requiring notice is this: that the earliest Christian writers apply to the celebration of the Eucharist the same sacrificial terms under which the prophets describe beforehand the worship of the Messianic kingdom, and, in one well-known instance, assume that the offering of the Eucharist is a fulfilment of these prophecies. Clement of Rome, a contemporary of the Apostles, thus alludes to the Christian worship of his own times:—

> "It behoves us to do all things in order which the Lord has commanded us to perform at stated times. He has enjoined offerings and services to be performed (*τάσδε προσφορὰς καὶ λειτουργίας ἐπιτελεῖσθαι*), and that not thoughtlessly or irregularly, but at the appointed hours, and times. Where, and by whom, He desires these things to be done, He Himself has fixed by His own Supreme will, in order that all things, being piously done according to His good pleasure, may be acceptable to Him. They therefore who present their offerings at the appointed times are accepted and blessed; for inasmuch as they follow the Law of the Lord they sin not."—Clem. I. Ep. xl.

Again,

> "Our sin will not be small if we eject from the Episcopate, those who have blamelessly and holily offered the gifts."—Clem. I. Ep. xliv.

This is a description of the functions of the Christian Ministry by a companion of Apostles. Many would pronounce it decidedly unscriptural, but it is in strict accordance with the prophetic intimations of what Christian worship was to be; and I suppose that these prophecies, being in Scripture, must be Scriptural. The language of Clement, also, be it well remembered, is in accordance with that of our Lord when, in the Sermon on the Mount, He speaks of men "bringing their gift to the altar." It is in accordance with the parallel which

the Apostle assumes between the partaking of the Lord's Table and the tables of devils, which were altars—and also with the Apostolic assertion, "We have an altar of which they have no right to eat who serve the tabernacle."* It is also in strict accordance with the Sacrificial language of the Psalms, which then, as now, formed a great part of Christian worship.†

When Clement asserts that the Lord Himself made regulations respecting Divine service, he was well able to know whether what he stated was a fact or not. The historical testimony of a companion of the Apostles is far preferable to the contrary surmise of some ultra-Protestant writer living eighteen centuries after the Apostolic age. And he is quite within the lines of Scripture in making this assertion, for it is clear, from the testimony of Scripture itself, that of the words of Christ and of His Apostles a very small portion has been preserved to us. Christ, after His Ascension, was during forty days speaking to the Apostles of the "things pertaining to the Kingdom of God;" but of the sayings of these great forty days only a few sentences have been preserved. Again, as I have before shown, the Apostles delivered to their Churches "ordinances" or "traditions," and made regulations respecting the Lord's Supper itself, which are not preserved in the New Testament.

There is ample reason, then, for believing that the statement of Clement is strictly historical.

To proceed, Ignatius speaks several times of the Lord's table as an altar.

Justin Martyr (A.D. 150) referring to the prophecy of Malachi that in every place incense and a pure offering should be offered to God, says—

> "He there speaks of those Gentiles, viz., us, who in every place offer sacrifices to him, *i.e.* the bread of the Eucharist and the cup of the Eucharist."‡

---

* This place is interpreted even by Baxter as referring to the Lord's table.

† Psalm xx. 3, xxii. 29, xxvi. 6, xxvii. 7, xliii. 4, li. 19, lxvi. 13, cxvi. 12, 13. These are only a few of the more prominent instances. The use of those Psalms in Christian assemblies, always with implied reference to the Messiah and His kingdom the Church, would almost force Christians to look out for some Christian application of this symbolical language; and so the Eucharist, as being their one great act of worship, would naturally furnish the means of such application.

‡ 'Dialogue with Trypho,' xli.

Irenæus bears the same testimony:—

"He took that created thing bread, and gave thanks and said, 'This is my body,' and the cup likewise, which is part of that creation to which we belong, He confessed to be His blood, and taught the New Oblation of the New Covenant, which the Church, receiving from the Apostles, offers to God throughout the world."*

The Ancient Liturgies are equally plain, as I shall hereafter have occasion to show. One instance at present will suffice. The Clementine, representing the most ancient type of all, has,—

"We offer unto thee, our King and our God, according to His institution, this bread and this cup, giving thanks to Thee through Him."

Such then is primitive Christian worship; the Prophets prophesying of it under distinctly sacrificial images, the earliest Fathers describing it in language replete with the same images, and the earliest Liturgies assuming that the act of worship which they enshrine is in some sense sacrificial. What that sense is we have now most carefully to investigate.

For, in the New Testament, no directly sacrificial language is applied to the Eucharist.

Again, taking our meaning of the word "sacrifice" from the things which are called "Sacrifices" in the Old Testament, and from the common signification of the word which prevails amongst us, there is no actual sacrifice whatsoever in the Eucharist.

In the sacrifices of the Law there was either the taking away of life, or the destruction, total, or partial, of the thing offered. In the great anti-typical Sacrifice—the one only real and true Sacrifice for all sin—there was death, accompanied by the greatest conceivable self-sacrifice; for the Life Himself became "obedient unto death, even the death of the cross." This was His Sacrifice, immeasurably sacrificial in the sense of self-surrender and self-abasement, so that there is no room for any other expiatory sacrifice whatsoever.

The Bible knows of no sacrifice in which nothing is parted with, nothing consumed. A rite—no matter how solemn and mysterious—in which there was no act of immolation, only

---

* Irenæus, Lib. iv. 17.

words said over the victim, and in which nothing was surrendered, could not be called a sacrifice. Now celebrate the Eucharist as we will, we cannot make it in the remotest degree to resemble any of the things which ordinary Englishmen, taught by their Bibles, call sacrifices. Not one of the practices which have of late years occasioned such litigation and controversy can make it in the least degree to resemble an actual sacrifice. They may be supposed to do honour to a Presence, but they cannot, and do not, aid any one to realise the sacrifice of that Presence; for the sacrifices from which we derive all our ideas of sacrificial worship consisted in acts in no respect such as those I advert to.

In the sacrifices which God ordained, the leading, indeed we may say the essential feature, was the surrender of life. Because of this it was that these sacrifices could prefigure the Great Priest Victim, Who gave His Life in sacrifice.

Do not let the reader suppose for a moment that in all this I am fencing with a shadow. Some reason must be found why the early Church, adopting the language of God-inspired prophets, should so persistently give a name to its great act of worship which seems so foreign to the nature of that worship, and this reason cannot be found till we have removed out of the way all that distracts our attention, and puts us, as it were, on a wrong track. A new sense of the term "sacrifice" must be found, or rather a sense which, whilst dropping the idea of sacrifice as a thing slain or immolated, goes deeper still into the region of the spiritual, and claims some mysterious hidden relation to the "heavenly things themselves" as its vindication.

The fact that the Eucharist, no matter how celebrated, does not exhibit one single feature of ancient sacrificial worship, must force itself, at times at least, upon the mind of any one who will permit himself to think steadily upon the matter. It forced itself upon the minds of the Fathers at the Council of Nice, when they decreed, "Let us understand in that Holy Table the Lamb of God that taketh away the sins of the world unsacrificially sacrificed," (*ἀθύτως θυόμενον*). Here, of course, they recognised the truth that death, which is the reality of sacrifices, is not in the Eucharist, because the One Victim does not die afresh.

The fact forced itself upon St. Chrysostom, when after having written, "We offer not another sacrifice but the same," he corrects himself as it were, and writes, "or *rather*, we celebrate the memorial of the sacrifice."

The fact forced itself upon Bishop Cosin when he wrote, "Upon the cross the oblation was made by a true destruction and death of the Live Thing, without which no sacrifice, properly so called, can be."

The fact at times forces itself upon the devout Romanist. In the 'Garden of the Soul' of Bishop Challoner, in the "Instructions for Mass," we read, "He also instituted the blessed Eucharist . . . . to be offered and presented by His Ministers to His Father (mystically broken and shed) as a sacrifice, not by way of a new death, but by way of a standing memorial of His death; a daily celebration and representation of His death to God, and an application to our souls of the fruits of it."

Now let a man talk ever so unreservedly about the Eucharist being a "real" "proper" "propitiatory" sacrifice, he can be at once brought down to the sober level of the above words, by being simply asked the two questions, "Would our Lord have offered a true, real, and propitiatory sacrifice, if He Himself had not suffered death?" and, "Does He suffer death afresh every time the Eucharist is celebrated?"

The reality of the sacrifice in the Eucharist in no way depends upon the nature of the Presence, as is too commonly asserted on the one side, and allowed on the other. On the hypothesis of Transubstantiation itself, That which is present does not suffer again that Death in which consisted the actual atoning Sacrifice. The real objective Presence may add intensity to the memorial act, but nothing to the idea of sacrifice. A sacrifice is not a thing merely, no matter how precious or holy, but an action performed on that thing as well.

The persistency with which the early Church ascribes sacrificial terms to the Eucharist, would lead us to seek in the account of the first institution of it the spiritual and evangelical reality of all God-ordained sacrificial acts.

The true sacrificial character of the whole act is to be found in the true significance of the word *ἀνάμνησις*. "Do this in remembrance of me," or rather, "for my memorial," *τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν.*

This word *ἀνάμνησις* in the language of Scripture always denotes a solemn public ecclesiastical memorial before God.

It is found in the New Testament only four times. Thrice in connection with the Eucharist,* and in the remaining instance (Hebrews x. 3), it denotes the annual public recognition before God of the sins of the people of Israel in the most solemn service of their ecclesiastical year. "In those sacrifices there is a remembrance (*ἀνάμνησις*) again made of sins every year." This remembrance of sins (as in fact every remembrance by way of burnt-offering must be) being, of course, wholly and solely before God. The particular sacrifices alluded to, viz., those of the great Day of Atonement, being peculiarly "before God," because the blood was then brought into the Holy of Holies—the very presence of God. It is used twice in the Septuagint, and in each case refers to a solemn ecclesiastical commemoration before God, the reference to the Godward character of the memorial being very express. In Numbers x. 10, reference is made to the blowing of the trumpets over the burnt-offerings, "that they may be to you a memorial before your God," *ἀνάμνησις ἔναντι τοῦ Θεοῦ ὑμῶν.* But by far the most remarkable and suggestive of the two cases is that in Leviticus xxiv. 7, 8. Translated according to the Septuagint, we read, "And ye shall put on the row (of loaves as the shewbread) pure frankincense and salt, and they shall be for loaves for a memorial (*ἀνάμνησιν*) set before the Lord (*ἔναντι Κυρίου*) continually in the face of the children of Israel for an everlasting covenant."

Surely if this shewbread, when set forth by Aaron, was a memorial before God, what must be that bread which is set forth by the one High Priest of Humanity, the eternal Priest after the order of Melchizedec; set forth after having been blessed by Him, identified by Him in some heavenly and spiritual, and therefore most true and real way with the Body given, and the Blood shed as the Blood of the New Covenant. Can such bread, rather can such a rite of "shewing forth" be less a "thing before God" than the shewbread? And surely the fact that our Bread is to be partaken of by all the priests of God, lay and cleric alike, cannot make it less an *ἀνάμνησις ἔναντι τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν.*

---

* Luke xxii. 19; 1 Cor. xi. 24, 25.

Here, then, is the one only sense in which the Eucharist can be regarded as sacrificial. If "Christ being raised from the dead dieth no more," then there can be no more than a commemoration or representation of His death in any rite whatsoever.

No matter how differently they may express themselves, the Ultra-montane and the Ultra-protestant, when their words come to be sifted, are here at one.

No one, unless he believes that Christ can die over and over again, can hold that the sacrificial action of the Eucharist is in its essence more than commemorative, and no one can hold that it is less.

What, then, is the difference between those who uphold and those who deny, the Eucharistic sacrifice? The greatest possible; for they differ in their respective estimates of the design and intention of the whole act: the one, the upholder of sacrifice, holds it to be a memorial BEFORE GOD; the other, the denier, only BEFORE MEN. The one, the upholder of sacrifice, holds it to be a memorial before God, because, as they of old set before God by their burnt-offerings the Sacrifice of His Son which was to be, so we, in Eucharist, set before Him the Sacrifice which has been, and in devout intention identify our act with that presentation of Himself on our behalf which He now makes in Heaven. The other, the denier of sacrifice, holds it to be a mere memorial before men, a sort of acted sermon on the Death of Christ, or a proclamation of our sense of our individual need of Him, and perhaps of our fellowship with certain Christians who agree with us in our views of religion.

The former of these is incomparably more agreeable to the words of Institution. It is far more worthy of the atoning nature of His Death, for His is the Death which alone we can plead before God. We can gratefully mention to one another other deaths besides His: His only can we mention before His Father.

But is it well to call this memorial a sacrifice, seeing that we actually immolate or destroy nothing? Strictly speaking, there has been in this fallen world but one sacrifice—that of the Lamb of God. Compared to this the Jewish rites were no sacrifices; for though they resembled the One Sacrifice in the matter of the death, which was common to both type and anti-

type, yet the very death itself of the victims under the Law was not the atoning thing, *per se,—i.e.*, apart from the Death of Christ,—otherwise the blood of bulls and of goats could have taken away sin.

Now that He has died once for all, and has risen again to be our life, His Death is shown forth by the emblems of life and refreshment. Bread is the staff of life, and wine revives the fainting soul. Both alike impart life and strength after they have been bruised and broken to the uttermost, and so are fitting emblems of Him Who imparts life and the abundance of life after He has been bruised and broken unto death in body and soul upon the cross. As mere emblems they would have a wondrous sacrificial expression, but they are more than emblems. They are identified in some infinitely mysterious but real way with His own sacrificial Body and Blood. Of no sacrifice of old could God have said, "This is my body." Of no blood of lambs or goats could God have said, "This is my blood." So that though in Holy Communion there is no death, yet there is that in it which identifies it in a heavenly and spiritual way with that which it exhibits. So if the spiritual and evangelical reality of all lesser sacrifices be in proportion to the closeness of their connection with the One Atoning Victim, it has, without the outward form, yet far more of the reality of Sacrifice than any Levitical offering could possibly possess.

Another point remains. In what part of the whole Eucharistic service does the actual sacrifice take place? This is a matter of far more difficulty than some of the most strenuous advocates of Catholic views suppose, for not only are one half of those who hold sacrificial views at variance with the other—the East with the West, but the most widespread Liturgical forms have, on this matter, no unity in themselves, but present to the attentive reader the greatest imaginable anomalies.

Let us begin with the Institution itself. Our Lord took bread, blessed it, brake it, and gave it to be there and then received, saying as He gave it, "Take eat, this is my body which is given for you," "Do this in remembrance of me," or for a "memorial" or "commemoration" of me.

Now supposing that by "do this" (ποιεῖτε) our Lord meant "offer this," how were they to *offer* it? Our Lord could not possibly have intended them to do with the bread which He was

giving them, as the Jews did with their minchah, or bread-offering, when they sacrificed it. What were the Apostles then to *do* in order to make the *ἀνάμνησις*?

Evidently they were to do all that He Himself had just done.* They were to "take," to "bless" or "give thanks;" to "break," to "give" in order to eating and drinking; for, according to all accounts, scriptural or traditional, Christ must have said, *τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν*, after He had taken, blessed, and broken, and whilst He was in the act of giving them to eat.

Again, if the words of St. Paul, "As oft as ye eat this bread and drink this cup ye show forth the Lord's death," mean a showing forth before God in solemn commemoration, then this depends on the partaking of the bread and the cup.

So that the words of Christ would lead us to connect the sacrificial action with the whole service; certainly including the "breaking of bread" and the reception.

When we examine the ancient Liturgies, as they have come down to us, we find great difficulty in ascertaining in what the compilers or the interpolators of them, as they now stand, considered the Eucharistic sacrificial action especially to consist.

The sacrificial or oblatory act must consist in one of three things.

1. The oblation of the unconsecrated elements, *i. e.*, of bread and wine over which the celebrant has not as yet said the formula which, in the view of those who use the Liturgy, is essential to make them the Body and Blood of Christ.

2. The oblation of the consecrated elements. Here the Body and Blood of Christ, according to some, in their natural substance, according to all, mysteriously identified with the elements, are offered to God. This is so immeasurably greater than the former, that it is difficult to conceive how the two can be named together.

3. The sacrifice is supposed to consist in, or to be spread over, the whole act of service.

Let us now examine the Liturgies.

---

* This is the proper drift of the word *remembrance* in our Lord's institution of the Sacrament. "Do this," He seems to say, "Bless, break, distribute, receive, this Bread: bless, distribute, drink of this cup; say over the two respectively, 'This is My body, this is My blood,' in order to that memorial sacrifice which belongs to Me; the memorial which My servants are continually to make of Me, among one another, and before My Father." —Keble's 'Eucharistic Adoration,' p. 68.

The Clementine is allowed on all hands to represent the earliest type of Eucharistic Liturgy. The oblatory or sacrificial passages of this Liturgy are two.

One, of the unconsecrated elements, which runs thus—

> "Wherefore having in remembrance His Passion, Death, and Resurrection . . . we offer to Thee, our King and our God, according to His Institution, this bread and this cup, giving thanks to Thee through Him, that Thou hast thought us worthy to stand before Thee, and to sacrifice unto Thee: And we beseech Thee that Thou wilt graciously look on these gifts now lying before Thee, O Thou self-sufficient God, and accept them to the honour of Thy Christ; and send down Thy Holy Spirit, the witness of the sufferings of the Lord Jesus on this sacrifice, that He may make this bread the body of Thy Christ, and this cup the blood of Thy Christ, that all who shall partake of it may be confirmed in godliness," &c.

Here the elements, *yet unconsecrated*, are offered to God, that He would accept them, and, because of this acceptance, send down the Holy Spirit to consecrate them.

But, after consecration, there is, towards the conclusion of this Liturgy, a second sacrificial prayer, running thus—

> "Again and again* let us pray to God through His Christ, in behalf of the gift that is offered to the Lord God; that the good God will receive it, through the mediation of His Christ, at His heavenly altar, for a sweet-smelling savour."

But be it remembered that, long before the putting up of this prayer, the gifts have been offered and accepted, for they are supposed to have been duly consecrated by the descent of the Spirit.

Why is it assumed that they have yet to be "received," and prayers put up "again and again" for their acceptance? What more is to be done to them, or with them? Only the receiving of them by the faithful.

Does, then, this prayer witness to the fact that in the earliest days the sacrificial act pervaded the whole service, and was not complete till the reception? I think it does.

But how utterly apart is this prayer from the Romanist conception of the matter; for if Christ Himself, Body, Blood, Soul, and Divinity be "the gifts," how incongruous to supplicate

---

* Ἔτι καὶ ἔτι δεηθῶμεν.

God, "again and again," on behalf of His own Son, supposed to be lying on the altar, that He will receive His own Son through the mediation of His Christ!

The Alexandrian Liturgy comes next. This is considered by all Liturgiologists to bear marks of the remotest antiquity: certainly in substance belonging to the earlier part of the Ante Nicene period; but the sacrificial or oblatory language of this Liturgy is exceedingly faint. It consists simply in the words—

> "O Lord our God, we have set before Thee thine own of thine own gifts." *

And this is all; for immediately after these words comes the consecration by the Prayer of Invocation, and there is no other sacrificial act or allusion to the end.

The sacrificial terms applied to the more solemn oblation of the elements in this most ancient Liturgy are not equal to the language applied (in the Pro-Anaphora) to the offering of the incense, and not to be compared in distinctness with what refers to the oblations of individual offerers, as the reader will perceive by the following:—

> "The thank offerings of them that offer sacrifices and oblations receive, O Lord, to Thy holy and celestial and rational altar to the height of the heavens by thy archangelic ministry; of them that offered much or little, secretly and with open boldness; of them that desired and had not withal to offer; and of those who have brought this day their oblations: as Thou didst receive the gifts of Thy righteous servant Abel, the sacrifice of our Father Abraham, the incense of Zacharias, the alms of Cornelius," † &c.

Now these offerings must be (some of them at least) over and above the bread and wine to be used in the Sacrament; but the terms in which these inferior offerings are offered are far more pronounced than the actual oblation itself in the most solemn part of the Liturgy, which, as I said, consists of the simple words, "We have set before Thee thine own of thine own."

The Liturgy of St. James presents the same type of Eucharistic service as the Clementine, but is very much interpolated. The sacrificial language throughout this Liturgy is far stronger

---

* *Τὰ σὰ ἐκ τῶν σῶν δώρων πρυεθήκαμεν ἐνώπιόν σου.*

† Neale's Translation, p. 19.

than the corresponding language in the Clementine and in the Alexandrian, but is also far more contradictory and inconsistent.

The first sacrificial allusion (in the Pro-Anaphora or less sacred portion) is in the words "Cause us to stand before Thy Holy Altar, that we may offer to Thee the sacrifice of praise."

In the next allusion, the whole service is designated as simply "a mysterious and fearful rite as an eternal remembrance for us continually."

I would now draw attention to two sacrificial passages, also in the Pro-Anaphora.

First, to an oblatory act over the incense—

> "Receive from the hands of us sinners this incense, as Thou didst receive to Thyself the offering of Abel, and Noe, and Aaron, and Samuel, and all Thy saints." *

Shortly after this the Holy Gifts, *i. e.*, the elements, are placed upon the altar, and yet over these gifts, so shortly to be identified by consecration with the Body and Blood of the Lord Himself, the very same petition is made which has already been made on behalf of the incense.

> "Yea, O Lord, look upon us, and have regard to this our reasonable service, and receive it [the holy gifts hereafter to be consecrated], as Thou didst receive the gifts of Abel, the sacrifices of Noe, the priestly offerings of Moses and Aaron, the peace-offerings of Samuel," &c. †

It seems incredible that men should pray in the same terms for the acceptance of so merely typical an offering as incense, and for the acceptance of gifts shortly to be put into the closest relation to the one all-prevailing Sacrifice of the God-man.

Let those account for such a contradiction who can. It seems to me to betray a wonderfully low view of the great Christian act of oblation, or at least a strange confusion of mind as to the respective acceptableness of gifts so diverse.

The actual sacramental oblation of this Liturgy is made in the words—

> "We therefore, sinners, remembering His life-giving passion, His salutary Cross, His Death and Resurrection . . . . offer to Thee, O

---

* Neale's Translation, p. 39.

† Ibid., p. 47.

Lord, this tremendous and unbloody sacrifice, beseeching Thee that Thou wouldest not deal with us after our sins," &c.

The reader may perhaps imagine that such terms could only be applied to that which by consecration had undergone the mysterious sacramental change; but it is not so, for this offering is made with that which is not yet consecrated by the Prayer of Invocation.

This oblation is identical, both in liturgical position and in intention, with that of the Clementine, "We offer to thee this bread and this cup;" and with that of the Alexandrian, or St. Mark's, "O Lord, we have set before Thee thine own of thine own gifts."

After this there is another prayer for the now consecrated elements—

"Again, and always in peace, let us make our supplication to the Lord. For the oblations, and hallowed, precious, celestial, ineffable, stainless, glorious, terrible, tremendous, divine gifts to the Lord God. That the Lord our God having received them to His holy, heavenly, intellectual, and spiritual altar, for the odour of a sweet-smelling sacrifice, would send down in their stead to us divine grace and the gift of the Most Holy Ghost."

The language of this prayer, by its turgidity and verbosity, betrays its late origin;* but even this prayer is utterly inconsistent with the conception of the Romanist that Christ Himself is lying on the altar, for how could He be called "oblations" and "gifts," and prayers put up on His behalf that He might be accepted?

The last sacrificial act of this Liturgy is this—"Thou hast received in Thy goodness the gifts, presents, fruits which have been offered before Thee for a sweet-smelling savour, and hast been pleased to sanctify and perfect them by the grace of Thy Christ and by the visitation of Thy Holy Spirit."

This, of course, is said over the consecrated elements; but how miserably short of the exceeding greatness of the change, to describe that which the Romanist assumes to have become the Body, Blood, Soul, and Divinity of Christ, as simply "gifts" or "fruits" sanctified by the grace of Christ!

---

* In fact, it is a mere swelling out by adjectives of the almost identical but simpler form in the Clementine, to which I have drawn attention. Its Liturgical position is precisely the same.

I shall not examine the Liturgies of Basil and Chrysostom, as they profess to be no more than adaptations of the original Liturgy of Jerusalem, and are altogether founded on it.

I now pass to the Great Western Rite, the Ordinary and Canon of the Roman Mass.

The substance of this Liturgy is undoubtedly above 1300 years old, but cannot be traced with any certainty to an older period; but this does not include any of its rubrics, which are all of a comparatively modern date, and some of them totally irreconcileable with the text or substance of the Liturgy itself.

Throughout this service the aspect of Holy Communion as a means of partaking in the Body and Blood of Christ bears no proportion to its sacrificial aspect. In this respect the Roman Ordinary and Canon is not only in the greatest contrast with our own, but with all primitive Liturgies. If the Liturgies of St. Clement or St. Mark, for instance, agree in the main with the form of service received from the Apostles, the Roman does not.

But in the next place, this service was put together by one who must have had the faintest possible grasp (if indeed he could be said to have had any at all) of the real objective Presence. One of its statements has been often quoted as nearer to the Calvinistic view than to any other. I allude, of course, to the words just before consecration:—

> "Which oblation do Thou, O God, vouchsafe in all things to make blessed, approved, ratified, reasonable, and acceptable, that it may become to us the body and blood of Thy Most Beloved Son."

This is, as I said, before consecration. After consecration, when that which is on the altar has been adored as being Christ Himself under the Veils, the following is put up:—

> "Not considering our merits, but pardoning our offences, through Christ our Lord. By whom, O Lord, Thou dost always create, sanctify, quicken, bless, and give us all these good things."*

Now what are "*all* the good things" here mentioned which, by Christ, God *creates*, *sanctifies*, *quickens*, *blesses*, and *gives* to us? Evidently those which are on the paten and in the chalice. But would any one who held that Transubstantiation had taken place,

---

* Per quem haec omnia Domine semper bona creas, sancti + ficas, vivi + ficas, bene + dicis.

and that bread and wine existed no longer, but that these gifts had become very Christ, speak thus of them? No one realising a change of substance of so tremendous a character would call the consecrated elements by names so inadequate to express their Deification.

Equally inconsistent with any realisation of the presence of Christ, as worshipped on the altar as God, is the prayer of the first ablution.

> "Grant, O Lord, that what [quod] we have taken with our mouth we may receive with a pure mind, and of a temporal gift may it become to us an eternal remedy."

The reader will notice that the parallelism here defines the sense of the words. By "what we have taken with our mouths" in the first part of the prayer is, of course, meant the "temporal gift" of the second part; but the celebrant is supposed to have received with the body of Christ, "whole Christ," perfectly hid under each species. How can "He" be called a temporal gift? Would any one who realised in any sense an objective presence have placed such a prayer here?

We now come to the sacrificial element in this service; and, first of all, we have to notice that there are two oblations or acts of sacrifice, each occupying its own half of the service: one in the Ordinary of the mass, or Pro-Anaphora, the other in the Canon or Anaphora—the first of the unconsecrated, and the second of the consecrated elements: one of bread and the chalice only, the other of Christ Himself; and yet both these acts of sacrifices, though one an offering of mere bread, the other of very Christ, have the same terms applied to them, and are each supposed to be valid for securing the same ends pertaining to salvation.

The first of these begins after the Nicene Creed, and with its introductory rubric stands thus—

> "This being finished, the priest takes the paten with the host, and, *offering it up*, says—'Accept, O Holy Father, Almighty, Eternal God, this immaculate host, which I, Thy unworthy servant, offer unto Thee, my living and true God, for my innumerable sins, offences, and negligences, and for all here present; as also for all faithful Christians, both living and dead, that it may be profitable for my own and for their salvation unto eternal life.'"

The act of offering here, as elsewhere, is in the present tense: the host is at this very time, if words have any meaning, set before God for His acceptance. And yet the inanimate thing offered is called by the same name (*immaculatam hostiam*), as long afterwards, when, having been consecrated, its accidents are supposed only to remain, and the adorable Victim Himself has taken its place.

After this there is a similar oblation of the chalice:—

> "Then the Priest takes the chalice, and offers it, saying,
>
> "'We offer unto Thee, O Lord, the chalice of salvation, beseeching Thy clemency, that in the sight of Thy Divine Majesty it may ascend with the odour of sweetness for our salvation, and for that of the whole world.'"

After this, over these creatures of bread and wine, not yet consecrated, there is offered up a prayer which answers exactly to the Prayer of Invocation of the Holy Ghost in all the Eastern Liturgies, and in the use of which prayer, according to the Eastern rites, the actual consecration takes place:—

> "Come, O Sanctifier, Almighty Eternal God, and bless this sacrifice prepared to Thy Holy name."

After this there is yet another oblation of the yet unconsecrated Elements in almost the same words as the most solemn Memorial, after the words of Institution, in the Eastern rites:—

> "Receive, O Holy Trinity, this oblation which we make to Thee in memory of the Passion, Resurrection, and Ascension of our Lord Jesus Christ," * &c.

After this there comes another prayer with reference to what has already been offered, that the sacrifice may be acceptable.

So far for the Ordinary, or less solemn part of the service.

Let any one take the trouble to compare all this with the Eastern Rites, and he will at once see that precisely the same sacrifice which in the Eastern Liturgies is made in the anaphoral or more solemn service is, in the Roman rite, made and *completed* in the introductory or less solemn part. In fact the sacrificial act of the less solemn part of the Roman Liturgy is

---

* Let the reader compare it with the prayer in the Clementine, "Wherefore having in remembrance His Passion, Death, and Resurrection from the dead . . . we offer to Thee our King and our God, according to His institution, this bread and this cup," &c.

incomparably stronger than that made in the Anaphoræ of the Clementine, or of St. Mark's, or even of St. James's Liturgy. Now if what is *unconsecrated* be offered in such terms, and for such ends, what can take place with respect to the consecrated? for, be it remembered, a moment is supposed to be fast approaching during the recitation of the remainder of this Liturgy when the things which have been offered will cease to exist, and the Divine Victim Himself will descend and take their place, also in His turn to be offered.

What more can be done to honour Him? We shall see.

The Canon proper commences thus:—

> "We therefore humbly pray and beseech Thee, most merciful Father, through Jesus Christ, Thy Son, our Lord, that Thou wouldest vouchsafe to accept and bless these gifts, these presents, these holy unspotted Sacrifices"* [which, let the reader remember, are at present only bread and mixed wine] "which in the first place we offer to Thee for Thy Holy Catholic Church . . . . and of all here present, for whom we offer, or who offer to Thee this Sacrifice of praise for themselves, their families, and friends, for the redemption of their souls," &c.
>
> "We therefore beseech Thee, O Lord, graciously to accept this oblation of our service."

A very cold way of naming that which the devout Romanist of these days is taught to believe will be, in a few moments, identical with the Sacrifice on the Cross.†

> "Which oblation do Thou, O God, vouchsafe in all things to make 'blessed,' 'approved,' 'ratified,' 'reasonable,' and 'acceptable,' that it may become to us the body and blood of Thy most beloved Son."

Let us pause here for a moment and consider to what these adjectives "approved," "ratified," "reasonable" (*adscriptam, ratam, rationabilem*) are supposed to refer. What change is at hand whereby God will make them "ratified" and "reasonable"? How will He do this? Why in a few moments it is supposed that He will cause the very Mediator Himself to come down, and occupy the place of what meets the outward eye. Is it possible that one who believes in his heart that such a change

---

* Hæc dona, hæc munera, hæc sancta sacrificia illibata.

† "This Sacrifice of the Mass is the same in substance with that which Christ offered for us on the Cross."—'Garden of the Soul.'

is impending should pray for it in terms so very measured? God, at the moment of consecration, is assumed to do that which exceeds all thought, and He is asked to make this oblation merely "*ratam, adscriptam, rationabilem, acceptabilemque.*" And He is asked to make it these things "in all things"* (*in omnibus*). What room can there be for any deficiency when no earthly thing will, on the Roman hypothesis, exist any longer?

Then comes the consecration itself—then the bread and wine are assumed to be no longer in existence. Christ Himself takes their place and He is adored. He is first adored by the Priest, and then shown to the people to be adored as God by them.

And now another oblation is made, to which every previous offering must be as nothing, and less than nothing: an oblation not of bread and wine—they are no longer in existence—but of the Adorable Victim Himself.

In what terms can He be offered?

Now, owing to the profuse use of the highest sacrificial language—in fact (and I use the word with much repugnance, but it is the only English word that will meet the case), owing to the "overdoing" of the sacrificial in the previous part, the One All-atoning Victim can only be offered to God in the same terms in which, at the commencement of this service, His mere inanimate creatures were offered.

The Lord Himself is, as the mere bread was before, only "*Hostia immaculata.*"

In the previous and less sacred part of the Mass His mere types were offered as *Hostia immaculata, sancta sacrificia illibata*, and He Himself is now offered as simply "*Hostia pura, Hostia sancta, Hostia immaculata.*" But, worse than all, God is now asked to regard this sacrifice of Christ Himself, lying on the altar, after He has been adored as Very God—He is asked to look upon the Body in which dwells the fulness of Godhead, and the Blood that is of worth to reconcile all things "*with a propitious and serene countenance*"—(Is it possible to imagine that one who realised the real objective presence should ask God so to look upon it?)—and to accept THEM—(Why should the plural number be used, seeing that Whole Christ is present under

---

* This is the translation authorsied by Cardinal Wiseman.

each species?)—as He was "graciously pleased to accept the gifts of His just servant Abel, and the sacrifice of our Patriarch Abraham, and the Holy Sacrifice, the Immaculate Host which His high Priest Melchizedec offered to Him" (*quod Tibi obtulit summus sacerdos Tuus Melchizedech, sanctum sacrificium, immaculatam hostiam*).

So that the mere typical bread of Melchizedec, the mere unconsecrated bread of the previous part of the service, and Christ Himself, are alike "*Hostia immaculata.*"*

No explanation can be given of all this except the very obvious one that the original service teaches one doctrine, and the rubrics, all appended at a later date, another. To say, as some Romanists do, that the mere unconsecrated wafer is called by the same name, and offered for the same purposes, as the consecrated, by some act of anticipation, is ridiculous; for on such an interpretation men have *first*, by an act of anticipation, to treat the unconsecrated as if it were consecrated, and then, after consecration, they must make an act of retrospection, and relegate the consecrated into the region of the unconsecrated, or how dare they ask God to accept IT (*i. e.* His Son on the altar) as He accepted certain mere unconsecrated typical matter, such as was the bread of Melchizedec?

No incongruity, no shortcoming, no mutilation in our Reformed Service can come near to this,—that men should make the Body of the One Adorable Victim, should worship it as identical with Himself, and then call it by the same names as they had given to the shadow which had preceded it, and finally ask God to accept *IT*, as He had accepted certain mere typical symbols between which and IT there is the gulf between the finite and the Infinite—between the creature and God.

From the preceding examination of Liturgies one thing is certain,—that the more sacrificial the general tenor of any Liturgy is, the more confused and inconsistent with itself it is, and this confusion culminates in the most Sacrificial of all Liturgies, the Roman.

Now all this is directly owing to the attempt to connect the

---

* It is impossible to accept the excuse sometimes urged that "time" is not to be predicated of the various stages of the sacrificial action, for this reason, that the rubric which enjoins adoration and genuflexion does mark the "time" of the all-important stage so expressly, that what applies to the Host *after* consecration cannot possibly be said of it *before*.

great sacrificial act of commemoration with one particular passage in the service to the exclusion of the rest. For doing this brings out the more prominently the difficulty inherent in the whole matter, which difficulty is that the Christian service is a service of words; and a true and proper Sacrifice can never be completed by the mere saying of words, no matter how fervent and devout, over the thing sacrificed. The Jewish Sacrifices were not consummated by the mere repetition of a formula ending in nothing, and the great Sacrifice on the Cross was not made in words, but by an unparalleled act of self-surrender, consumed too, as it were, by the fiercest fire of agony, and perfected in an actual death. It is the felt difficulty of the fact that there has been no actual distinctly sacrificial action on the part of the celebrant, which in the very earliest types of Liturgy suggests the prayer, long after consecration, "Again and again let us beseech the Lord through His Christ, in behalf of the gift that is offered to the Lord God, that the good Lord will receive it," &c. What can this prayer imply, but that all which Christ ordained as His commemoration has not yet been done, for the people have not yet received?

We now come to the Liturgy of the English Church. With us there is a distinct oblation of the elements yet unconsecrated. In this we follow all Liturgies and the notices of the Eucharist in the earliest writers.

But is this THE commemoration?

If the *ἀνάμνησις* can be made with that which is consecrated, certainly not.

All the most ancient Liturgies make their oblation with the same unconsecrated elements as we do in our Prayer for the Church Militant, and with no more; for the oblation in these Liturgies is made before the Prayer of Invocation, in which with them consecration consists. But if the commemoration *can* be made with that which is, by consecration, mysteriously identified with His Body and Blood it must be so, for such an *ἀνάμνησις* must be infinitely greater than any made with elements which are in all respects, actually or relatively, in the same condition as the merely typical bread offered under the Law.

But how is such a commemoration to be made? With us it is made by the consecration and immediate consumption of what is consecrated, and by all.

It is with us as it was at the very first. We take and eat at this commemoration that which by His own words has been consecrated.

After this there are two (verbal) acts of sacrifice. "We, Thy humble servants, entirely desire Thy Fatherly goodness mercifully to accept this our Sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving;" and "Though we be unworthy to offer unto Thee any Sacrifice, yet we beseech Thee to accept this our bounden duty and service."

What has been done by us when these sacrificial words are said? I answer, All, *and not less than all*, that was ordained in the upper chamber. The bread has been taken, sanctified with the word of Christ and prayer, *broken*, and devoutly consumed by both celebrant and worshippers. And as to the cup, it too has been blessed and *all* have drunk of it, as He said that it was to be—and both bread and cup have been given and received in distinct token of remembrance, so that one and all have shown forth His death by eating the bread and drinking the cup, as His Apostle, speaking by His Spirit, ordained.

The English Office, in a most marvellous way, incorporates all the leading features of the Institution, and recognises all its ends, as such features or ends appear in Scripture and in the earliest Offices.

1. The mystery connected with the due reception—that we "spiritually eat the flesh of Christ and drink His blood, we dwell in Christ and Christ in us," is recognised more plainly than in any other Liturgy which has come down to us.

2. This inestimable gift is set forth as given to us, not in the exercise of some act of internal faith merely, but in the devout and faithful reception of that which has been set apart by a minister of the Organization which Christ ordained.

3. The Sacrificial or Commemorative action agrees perfectly with those intimations of the will of our Great High Priest which we gather from the Evangelic narrative: for it consists with us in doing all that He bid us do, and is not confined to any mere verbal form said over the elements; whilst there is an oblation of what is unconsecrated, quite sufficient to put us in accord with the teaching of the earliest Fathers and the practice of the earliest Liturgies.

4. There is a recognition of the office of the Holy Commu-

nion to assure the baptized that they continue in the unity of the one body, such as exists in no other rite in use.

5. There is a form of actual "Breaking of the Bread" as coincident with consecration more distinct than in any other Liturgy. That the actual breaking must have been at the first a most prominent part of the whole rite is certain, both from the account of what the Lord did at the Institution, and from the fact that, in New Testament times, this part of the action gave its name to the Sacrament itself. The Pentecostal Christians continued steadfastly in the "breaking of bread," and on the first day of the week "the disciples came together to break bread." The "breaking" of the bread is even set forth as parallel to the "blessing" of the cup (1 Cor. x. 16).

If the "Breaking of the Bread" had not greater prominence at the first than it has in most Liturgies, it is difficult to understand how the rite should have ever been named after it.*

6. There is an act of self-oblation which seems fitting when we are presenting before God the memorials of such loving self-surrender—"Here we present unto Thee, O Lord, ourselves, our souls and bodies, to be a reasonable, holy, and lively sacrifice unto Thee."

The Sacrifice of Christ has been pronounced to be the greatest moral act ever performed, and the sacrificial commemoration of such an act should not be without its corresponding "moral act." Christ should be offered on the sacrifice and service of our faith—not of our words only, but of our active, energizing faith. And we have ample opportunity for this. We have the offering of our substance, and the offering of ourselves, souls and bodies, incorporated in this our great religious act of duty

---

* "The breaking the bread before consecration, though apparently 'most agreeable with the institution of Christ,' is peculiar to the English rite. In all other Liturgies it occurs after the consecration, usually after the Lord's Prayer, with which the long Consecration Prayer invariably closes, and shortly before the dipping of a portion into the cup before actual communion, a rite which is found in all the great Liturgies of East and West."—*Note in Annotated Book of Common Prayer.* This note is inaccurate and misleading; for, in the first place, there is a considerable interval between the Lord's Prayer and the Breaking of the Bread, in which interval in the Eastern rites the Sancta Sanctis has place, and the dipping of a portion of bread into the cup has no place in the two most ancient rites, the Clementine and St. Mark's, and it is not even remotely alluded to by Cyril of Jerusalem in his account of the Liturgical rite of Jerusalem in the middle of the fourth century.

and service. "God will not receive Christ from us without ourselves, nor ourselves without Christ. Only that oblation where the self-sacrifice of Christ and His members is united, is pleasing to Him, and befits the disciples of the Crucified."* No Liturgy has any act of self-oblation so full and explicit. The Canon of the Mass has no offering of alms even answering to ours.

7. The good providence of God has so ordered it that our own Liturgy retains all, or almost all, the great features of ancient Liturgical worship. The marvellous agreement of all ancient forms for the celebration of the Eucharist in certain well-defined acts of prayer and praise cannot be accounted for on any other hypothesis than this,—that the Apostles themselves ordained the use of these acts. No authority subsequent to the Apostolic could possibly have imposed the use of such acts on all Christendom, for there is not an ancient Liturgy which does not contain all or almost all of them. For instance, all the more sacred and ancient parts of these Liturgies begin with "Lift up your hearts," or words very similar, and they are always followed by the response, "We lift them up unto the Lord."

All these Liturgies contain the Anthem of the Seraphim—the "Holy, Holy, Holy, Lord God of Hosts"—always prefacing it with somewhat different words, but invariably incorporating it into the earlier portion of the more solemn part. They all contain the recitation of the words of Institution: they all contain a long act of intercession, and a prayer for those departed in the Lord, that they may rest in peace. They all contain the Lord's Prayer, introduced almost invariably by a peculiar preface, professing particular unworthiness to say this prayer of all others, and asking for grace to say it aright with holy boldness.

I have noticed before, that the Eastern and most ancient forms all contain an act of oblation of the unconsecrated elements that God would vouchsafe to accept them—and the actual consecration (in all Eastern rites) is supposed to depend upon a prayer for the descent of the Holy Ghost upon the gifts. There is also in almost all ancient Liturgies a very peculiar form, "Holy Things for Holy Persons," with a response, also of a peculiar character, always following it. There is also, though far nearer the end of

---

* Döllinger's 'First Age of Christianity,' Book II., ch. iii. p. 212, 2nd edition, translated by Oxenham.

the service than with us, the breaking of the bread, and the distribution, with certain words said severally to each communicant, as in our rite.

I would also draw particular attention to the fact that every ancient form of Communion service without exception gives opportunity to the whole body of the congregation to join in with their voices by way of response. There are particular acts of responsive worship at the very commencement of the Anaphora, when, in answer to the words, "Lift up your hearts," the people are directed to respond, "We lift them up unto the Lord." These acts of responsive worship occur all through the various Liturgies. The people are especially directed to chant the "Holy, Holy, Holy," in the Hymn of the Seraphim. They have also particular opportunity given for response in the very recitation of the formula of Institution itself. They have also a response of their own after the "Holy Things for Holy Persons" in all the Eastern rites. By these responsive acts of worship the priesthood of the lay people as qualifying them to take part in the most solemn acts of worship is distinctly recognized. Our own Liturgy has preserved the greater part of these features. We have the "Sursum Corda," the Hymn of the Seraphim, or Triumphal Hymn, the Recitation of the words of Institution, the great Intercession in our Prayer for the Church Militant. We have the Lord's Prayer, though without its preface and embolismus—we have also an oblation of the unconsecrated things. We follow the Roman rite in not having the Invocation and the Sancta Sanctis.*

But, in the last place, the Anglican service is at one with Scripture, and with all ancient Liturgies, in not containing any recognition of Holy Communion as a means of bringing Christ amongst us as an object of Divine worship. Holy Communion was

---

* It may be a question with many whether, seeing that such forms as the Invocation of the Holy Spirit to bring about the consecration, and the prayer for the departed, and certain other features, such as the Sancta Sanctis, are undoubtedly primitive, we ought not to do our best for their restoration. Now, I would humbly suggest that a certain leading of God's providence clearly shows that it can hardly be His will that we should agitate the Church for the restoration of these forms; for in our own country, at the beginning of the last century, a service containing all or almost all the ancient forms which we have lost, was compiled and published by devout and learned men, who had given up all for conscience' sake, and it failed utterly, only fomenting further divisions in the little band of Nonjurors amongst whom it was put forth.

ordained by Christ as the means whereby we are to partake of His Body and Blood, and as a perpetual commemoration before God of the Sacrifice on the Cross; but there is no further purpose of the Institution so much as hinted at by Christ or by His Apostles.

The Fathers are equally ignorant of any such function of Holy Communion. Justin Martyr, in his well-known passage on the Eucharist, recognises the ineffably close relation between the signs and the things signified, and at the conclusion tells us that in his days the consecrated elements were reserved: but for what purpose? not that, as in the present Church of Rome, they should be shut up in a piece of church furniture and kept as a perpetual Presence, but that they should be consumed as the Eucharist by the sick.

Now if Christ can be brought thus personally on our altars, why should He not remain there, and a lighted lamp be suspended before Him, to assure us that He is locally present to be worshipped? It seems inconceivable that they, who believe that He can thus be brought from heaven, should bow down and worship Him for only the briefest space, and then dismiss Him, after having offered to Him one transient act of homage—for worship it can hardly be called.

It seems far more natural, if possible, to secure His continued presence under the veils or symbols. But it is clear that, if all this had been in the power of the Church, she could not have been utterly unconscious of it, as assuredly she was for above a thousand years. So far from drawing the inference which modern Romanists, on their own principles, draw most naturally from this (supposed) design of the Eucharist, she seems from the first to have ordained that all such modes of perpetuating the Presence are unlawful; for from the first she has ordained the entire consumption of all that was consecrated.*

I now turn to the Liturgies. "The Primitive Liturgies," writes Mr. Keble, "are almost, or altogether, silent as to any worship of Christ's Body and Blood after consecration. We find in them neither any form of prayer addressed in special to His Holy Humanity so present, nor any rubric injoining adoration inward or outward." †

---

* See Beveridge on Article XXVIII. Jewel's 'Defence of Apology,' vol. iii. pp. 552–555, Parker Society.

† Keble on 'Eucharistic Adoration,' 3rd ed. p. 113.

But the undesigned testimony of Dr. Neale is still more decisive. He appends this note to a prayer which occurs after the consecration in the Liturgy of St. Mark. "This is the prayer of Intense Adoration, which has its place in all Oriental Liturgies, and answers to the worship paid by the Western Church to our Lord's Sacramental Body and Blood at the elevation of the Host."

Now what is this prayer, of which this most learned Liturgiologist, whose views would certainly lead him to discern the faintest sign of adoration, thus speaks? Is it any form of prayer to Christ's Presence? So far from this, it is a prayer not addressed to Christ at all, but to God the Father.

There are prayers in all respects parallel (in fact, modifications of some original form) in the Liturgies of St. James and in the Clementine. That in St. James is—

> "To Thee, O Lord, we Thy servants have bowed our necks before Thy Holy Altar, waiting for the rich mercies which are from Thee: send down upon us, O Lord, thy rich grace and blessing; and sanctify our souls, bodies, and spirits, that we may become worthy partakers and communicants of Thy holy mysteries, to the forgiveness of our sins and eternal life. For Thou art to be worshipped and glorified, O our God, and Thine only begotten Son, and Thy Most Holy Spirit, now and ever."

There is no prayer addressed to Christ in the Clementine, and but one in St. Mark's, before reception, in which last He is addressed, not as in any sense comprehended under the bread, but as the "Incomprehensible Word ruling with the Father and the Holy Ghost."

But there is a prayer in the Liturgy of St. James to be said just before receiving, which is exceedingly suggestive as to what should be the true attitude of the believer's mind with respect to the special presence of Him Whose very Human Nature is inseparable from that Godhead Which we believe to be everywhere present. It runs thus:—

> "Lord our God, the heavenly Bread, the Life of the world, I have sinned against heaven and before Thee, and am not worthy to partake of Thy spotless mysteries; but do Thou, who art a compassionate God, make me worthy by Thy grace to communicate without condemnation in the holy Body and precious Blood for the remission of sins and eternal life."

This is a prayer addressed to Christ, not as personally present in, or included under, the bread, but rather as external to it; external to it, I say, in this sense, that He who feeds us with bread (or prepares us to receive bread aright) must be in some sense external to the bread with which He feeds us; and this prayer is addressed to Him as thus external. Whilst calling Him the Bread from Heaven, it is plainly not addressed to Him as veiled under the bread in any sense, and it is the only prayer so addressed to Him in the Liturgy.

There is in the Liturgy of St. Chrysostom a rubric directing the priest to adore, but its reference is very doubtful; for, when the direction is given, the elements are not supposed to be consecrated, and the words of prayer directed to be said whilst "adoring" are the most general possible. In fact they are simply "God be merciful to me a sinner." This rubric is, in fact, nothing like so distinct as a rubric in a previous part of the service, ordering adoration to the book of the Gospels, which runs thus:—

> "Having adored with reverence the Holy Gospel [*i. e.* the mere book or manuscript], he takes it up," &c.

Again, as is well known, the Greeks direct adoration to the yet unconsecrated elements at what is called the Great Entrance. What would then their adoration of the consecrated, if there were any rubric for it, be worth?

And this leads me, very briefly, to consider in what "adoration" consists. For it appears, when we examine the use of the words, by no means to imply acts of prayer and praise.

Johnson explains it as meaning—

1. The external homage paid to the Deity.
2. Homage paid to persons in high worth or esteem.

There is no treatise in which it is possible to conceive this matter of adoration treated more fully or more deeply than in that of Mr. Keble; but, after the most careful examination of it, I am unable to say whether Mr. Keble means anything more than the profoundest reverence, expressed in suitable gestures and demeanour of the body, or (if he means something more than this) what, or how much more. For at the very outset of this remarkable treatise, in fact in the second page of his preface, Mr. Keble has appended this note:—

"I have stated in the outset of the argument, and I hope it will be borne in mind all along, that nothing external is necessarily implied; nothing indeed new or strange, nor more than pious Church people (unless they have been embarrassed by theories) habitually practise, though it may be with something of ignorance or indistinctness."

Again, p. 117, he quotes with apparent approval the words of St. Augustine:—

"To intercede or pray is one thing—to adore is another. Whoever prays asks, but not every one who adores asks. Remember the custom of Kings: they are commonly adored with a civil kind of worship, and not asked for anything. Sometimes they are asked without being adored."

Again he cites (p. 3) the case of men kneeling before a father, or bishop, to receive his blessing, as a case capable of being associated at least with Eucharistic adoration, though, of course, not strictly parallel.

I cannot but gather from the greater part of Chapter IV. that he considers kneeling whilst we receive Holy Communion not only to be adoration of the special, though not corporal, Presence, but also to be a sufficient sign of such adoration, for he refers, apparently with approval, to the practice of the most ancient times that "kneeling, or standing with inclination of the head (*venerabiliter curvi*) was always accepted as a sufficient sign of adoration." Now (and I write it with the utmost reverence for the opinions, or reasoning of such a man) it seems to me that Mr. Keble's argument, unless it be accepted with a most necessary theological qualification (to which qualification he himself especially directs us) ought to lead us to much more than this.

His argument is this: The presence of the Body and Blood of Christ necessarily implies the especial presence of Christ Himself on the altar. But, if so, surely the very moment He comes down amongst us His presence should be recognised; but Mr. Keble could not possibly allow this and write the note in which he guards himself against being supposed to uphold "more than pious Church people habitually practise."

If He be present to be worshipped, surely the lowest and most prolonged prostration, consistent with proceeding with the

service at all, can hardly be deemed sufficient; and, of course, at the moment when He is supposed to come amongst us.

If He be personally present before us, then the sort of adoration which is accorded to Him by the Romish celebrant, a single genuflexion or curtsey, is simple irreverence. In this, as in all else, the Mass, taken in connection with its rubrics, is scandalously inconsistent with itself, for, in the recitation of the Nicene Creed, long before Consecration, there is, in the Rubric, direction given for a far more devout and prolonged act of reverence to His Humanity,* though, of course, that Humanity must then be conceived of as infinitely more distant than after Consecration.

Is, then, Mr. Keble right in so emphatically stating that he upholds nothing "external," "nothing new or strange or more than pious Church people have habitually practised"? Are the ancient Liturgies right in giving no directions for any outward worship of any sort, on or after consecration?

Unquestionably they are right: for other considerations, besides that of the Presence under the bread, must find a place in the believer's mind. For the Presence, whatever be its nature or mode, is the Presence of One Who is, by the perfect union between His two natures, fully and perfectly present as one Person, God and Man, One Christ, *before* Consecration;† and present, too, for distinctly Eucharistic purposes. He, God and Man, is fully and perfectly present to feed His people, according to His own gracious assurance, "Labour . . . . for that bread which endureth unto everlasting life, which the Son of Man shall give you; for Him hath God the Father sealed."

He, God and Man, is also fully present as the One Eternal Priest, really and truly presenting before His Father the whole Eucharistic service of His people.

Mr. Keble has helped us to the true vindication of our own

---

* When he (the priest) says the words God, Jesus Christ, and "is adored," he bows his head to the Cross. But at the words "and was incarnate," he kneels down, and continues kneeling to the words, "and was made man."

† Inasmuch as that Infinite Word is not divisible into parts, it could not in part but must needs be wholly incarnate, and consequently, wheresoever the Word is, It hath with it manhood, else should the Word be in part or somewhere God only and not man, which is impossible. For the person of Christ is whole, perfect God and perfect man wheresoever, although the parts of His manhood being finite, and His Deity infinite, we cannot say that the whole of Christ is simply everywhere, as we may say that His Deity is, and that His Person is by force of Deity.—Hooker, 'Eccles. Pol.,' book v. ch. lv. sec. 7.

national Communion Offices both before and after the Reformation* as well as of all the ancient Liturgies, in not directing special adoration to the elements immediately on or after Consecration in the following passage (chap. iii. p. 115):—

> "The clear mind of the Church in her Eucharistical offices has always been to offer the sacrifice directly and immediately to God the Father only. Not as if we were ignorant how inseparable the persons of the Blessed Trinity are, nor as if we were excluding the Most Holy Son and Spirit from being truly recipients of the Christian Sacrifice—which kind of error was once censured in the Eastern Church;—but because Holy Scripture everywhere teaches, that it has pleased Him so to order the economy of our Redemption, as that each Person shall have His own work therein, to which He is in a certain sense nearer than either of the Other Two: *e.g.*, in the mystery of the altar (which in heaven is the mystery of Christ's Intercession) the Holy Ghost prepares the Sacrifice, the Son offers it (being His own incarnate Self), and the Father receives it. And by Divine instinct, as it may seem, the Holy Church from the beginning has been taught to arrange her Liturgies in conformity with this."

Now, if God has been pleased so to order the Economy of Redemption that, in the great commemorative act of Christian worship, the devout recognition of the Peculiar Work of each Person implies that we should not, in that act of worship, specifically address the Second Person, because the theory of the whole Eucharistic act requires that we should pray "through" Him rather than "to" Him: much more does the theory of the whole act require that we should not worship Him as personally included in, or identified with, the bread; for we worship *persons* rather than *things*, and surely the aspect of His presence as "Priest" and as "Feeder" is more *personal* than as Victim or as Food. If, then, the early Christians, in Eucharist, rightly restrained themselves from worshipping Him as Priest, though, as such, they recognised His special presence, would they not

---

* There is no direction for adoration whatsoever in the Canon according to the Use of Sarum. The words "inclinet se sacerdos ad Hostiam," of which a translation is introduced by my friend Mr. Medd in his translation of the Use of Sarum in the Annotated Prayer-Book (p. 201), seems to have been unwittingly interpolated from the Bangor Use. There is no rubric for elevation in the Hereford Use. The Roman has "Prolatis verbis consecrationis Hostiam consecratam genuflexus adorat: surgit, ostendit populo, reponit super corporale, iterum adorat." But see Maskell's 'Ancient Liturgy of the Church of England,' p. 93.

(as they did) equally restrain themselves from worshipping Him as Food, which in Eucharist He is? We are continually reminded by those who take the most pronounced view of the real objective presence that it is supra-local: but, if so, ought we not to fear exceedingly how we localise it, by worship locally directed to it, as if it were in all respects local and comprehensible?

The Eucharistic Service of the Church of England is substantially a new service. If we take even the Communion Office of 1549, and compare it with the Canon according to the Use of Sarum, we find that by far the greater part of it is new.* It doubtless embodies more or less of the leading features of the ancient offices, as well as of that which it superseded; but, of the greater part of these features, both the wording and the liturgical position are very materially altered.† It seems absurd to question or deny this. The reader has only to put the Canon of the Mass side by side with our own service, and he will see at once that, notwithstanding the retention of some ancient forms, such as the "Sursum Corda," Angelic Hymn, &c., the leading ideas of the two services materially differ: whereas the Old Service is mainly a sacrificial rite, the New is mainly a communion or partaking; whereas in the Old Services the commemorative or sacrificial action (or rather actions) is altogether severed from the partaking on the part of the people, in the new it is inseparably bound up with it: whereas in the Old Service the Celebrant is everything, so that he can perform the whole action by himself; in the New, on the contrary, he is never contemplated apart from the united action of that mystical body of which he is the minister.‡

---

* The office of 1549 occupies twenty-three closely printed pages at the end of Mr. Maskell's 'Ancient Liturgies of the Church of England,' and of these not above two pages are to be found in the Sarum Missal. The parts which are reproduced are:—1, the Lord's Prayer; 2, Prayer for Purity; 3, Gloria in Excelsis; 4, the Creed; 5, Sursum Corda; 6, "therefore with Angels and Archangels;" 7, the Absolution. Such all-important features as the Offertory, Prayer of Oblation, Prayer of Intercession, Confession, Prayer of Consecration, including words of Institution, and the whole of the Post Communion, differ exceedingly from the corresponding parts of the Sarum Canon.

† When I say that our Service is a new rite, I mean that though it is a restoration, as far as may be, of the Scriptural and Primitive Church Service, yet that it is a new composition. It is not an older Liturgy rewritten. It is not an "Eclectic" rite, such as a modern liturgiologist would put together.

‡ And *vice versâ*, the action of that body is never contemplated apart from him.

It seems to be worse than unmeaning; it is an actual deceptain, to clothe such an office with the ritual adjuncts and accessories of the office which it has superseded. Our present office may be a worse one, or it may be a better, but it is assuredly not the same. Its matter—*i.e.* the contents of four-fifths of it—is different; its arrangement, its primary intention, and its mode of carrying out that intention, differ materially, if not essentially, from those of the ancient rite of this kingdom, even as it appears in the Use of Sarum.

A rite in which the primary intention is that the people should communicate, and in which the great sacrificial memorial is not made without such communion, cannot, in reason, have the same ritual clothing as a rite in which the sacrificial memorial is made and completed by one man long before any communion. It is wrong, then, in principle, to attempt to conform, as far as possible, to the ritual of the unreformed service books. It is an attempt to make two services, which are very different, to appear the same.

It does not enter into the design of this Essay to examine legal and liturgical questions respecting the interpretation of rubrics; such, for instance, as the one respecting Ornaments. I rather confine myself to principles, and their bearing on these details, and the reader, I trust, will forgive me if I adhere to this plan in the remarks I shall now make on the details of Christian and Church-of-England Ritual.

I shall first (as the most important) take notice of the four matters which have been the subject of legal proceedings.

I. "The elevation, during, or after consecration, in the order of the administration of the Holy Communion, of the Paten and Cup, and kneeling or prostrating oneself before the consecrated elements."

If the assertion of Mr. Keble be true (as unquestionably it is) that "we find in them [the ancient Liturgies] neither any form of prayer addressed in special to His Holy Humanity so present, nor any rubric enjoining adoration inward or outward," then the decisions of the Dean of Arches, and of the Privy Council have, so far, kept our mode of celebration in accord with that of the Church in the earliest ages, and have also saved us from a miserably inadequate mode of recognising the presence of Christ; for could any one who really believed

himself to be face to face with the Eternal Son of God in our nature be content with according to Him the act of adoration usual in the Romish Celebration?

But be it remembered that this elevation and adoration by genuflexion is the only one of the matters brought under litigation which has any real dogmatic significance—I mean the only one which has any bearing on distinctly Eucharistic doctrine. This I shall ever keep in view in my further remarks.

II. "The use of lighted candles on the Communion Table during the celebration of the Holy Communion, when such candles are not wanted for the purpose of giving light."

There is no evidence whatsoever in the records of the early Church of candles being used in the day-time for any typical or dogmatic purpose connected with the Eucharist.

On the contrary, it is impossible to suppose that, if candles were used for any purpose of Christian symbolism in the time of Lactantius (*i.e.* about A.D. 320), he would have ridiculed the use of them in broad daylight in the heathen temples. His words are:—

> "Mactant igitur opimas ac pingues hostias Deo quasi esurienti; profundunt vina tanquam sitienti, accendunt lumina velut in tenebris agenti."

Again—

> "Vel si cœleste lumen, quod dicimus solem, contemplari velint; jam sentiant, quod non indigeat lucernis eorum Deus, qui ipse in usum hominis tam claram, tam candidam lucem dedit."

Again—

> "Num igitur mentis suæ compos putandus est, qui Auctori et Datori luminis, candelarum ac cerarum lumen offert pro munere." (Lib. vi. ch. 2.)

By the time of Jerome the custom appears to have been gaining ground in the West; but, even then, only to do honour to the tombs of the martyrs, not to symbolize any doctrine connected, even remotely, with the Eucharist. Jerome simply excuses the practice in these words:—

> "Cereos autem non clarâ luce accendimus sicut frustra calumniaris, sed ut noctis tenebras hoc solatio temperemus, et vigilamus ad lumen, ne cæci tecum dormiamus in tenebris. Quod si aliqui

propter imperitiam et simplicitatem sæcularium hominum, vel certe religiosarum fœminarum; de quibus vere possumus dicere, 'Confiteor zelum Dei habent, sed non secundum scientiam,' hoc pro honore martyrum faciunt, quid inde perdis?"

It is clear that Jerome excuses the lighting of lamps in the day-time as a pardonable weakness. If they were kindled at the celebration of the Eucharist for any typical purpose he would not have confined his vindication to the lighting in honour of the martyrs. He mentions at the conclusion of his remarks on this matter that the Oriental Churches lighted lamps—not, however, at the consecration, but at the reading of the Gospels, at which time common sense seems to teach us that if lighted candles be used symbolically at all, they are far more appropriate, for there must be a certain order and discrimination in typical or symbolical teaching. Our Lord is "full of grace and truth," and all the ordinances of His Church are the means whereby we are made partakers of His grace and truth; but His grace is multiform, and in some ordinances some particular aspects of His grace shine forth more clearly than in others. In the Eucharist He appears as the Bread of Life. Now, it is the function of bread to sustain life—not specifically to enlighten. Again, as is well known, the ancients from the first connected the illuminating grace of Christ rather with the Sacrament of Baptism, and (as Jerome testifies) the Oriental Churches connected it with the reading of the Gospels.

Again, if we look to the Eucharist as a Sacrificial Commemoration, candles seem altogether out of place, for they have nothing to do, even remotely, with sacrifice.*

III. Incense has no symbolical or dogmatic bearing whatsoever with respect to the Eucharist. The Mass is, in the vast majority of cases, celebrated without it. It is quite clear, then,

---

* The candlestick in the Jewish temple which seems, on the authority of the New Testament (Revelations i.), to have symbolized the sevenfold gifts of the Spirit, was a candelabrum of seven branches, springing from one stem. See particularly Bp. Wordsworth's note on Revelations i. 12. In the Greek Church, according to Dr. Neale, a certain double taper (dikerion), held in the hands of the priest, typifies the illumination brought to pass in heaven and earth by the Incarnation of Jesus in His two natures, and so this dikerion has two branches springing from *one* handle. In the same Church, according to the same learned person, the Pontiff proclaims the Trinity by signing the Gospel with a three-headed taper (Trikerion), having three branches from one stem; but what can two separate candlesticks signify?

that the use of Incense, even in the Romish Church, cannot be to do honour to a Presence, because that Presence is assumed to be as whole and complete in the Low Mass without incense as in the High. In fact, incense is just such an accessory as music, and no more. Typically it betokens the acceptableness of prayer. As the smoke of the incense ascends up, carrying its fragrance with it, so the prayers of the saints (Rev. v. 8) ascend up to God as a sweet-smelling savour. There is, I am bound to say, not a trace in the ancient Liturgies of the very evangelical reason assigned by a popular ritualistic clergyman, that it betokens the merits of Christ. The Clementine, representing by far the most ancient type of all, has no reference to any use of incense. The Liturgies of St. Mark and St. James assume its use in the Pro-Anaphora, and the Liturgy of St. Mark once in an early part of the Anaphora; but how? Not in the least degree as typical, or symbolical, or instructive, but as constituting in itself a collateral—though, of course, very subordinate—act of sacrifice. Thus, in St. Mark (in connection with the reading of the Gospel):—

> "We offer incense before Thy Glory, O Lord. Do Thou receive it to Thy Holy and Super-celestial altar. Do Thou, in its stead, send down the grace of Thy Holy Spirit."*

Again, in St. James's Liturgy—

> "Receive from the hands of us sinners this incense, as Thou didst receive to Thyself the offering of Abel and Noe, and Aaron and Samuel, and all Thy saints," &c.†

Similarly in the Roman Mass, at a High Celebration, the Incense is offered up as a separate offering—

> "May the Lord, by the intercession of Blessed Michael, the Archangel, standing at the right hand of the altar of Incense, and of all his elect, vouchsafe to bless this Incense, and receive it as an odour of sweetness," &c.

If incense be offered up as music is offered up, it seems to me perfectly right that a Church should adopt it. It came into general use about the fifth or sixth century, perhaps in some parts of the Church somewhat earlier; but there are references

---

* Neale's Translation, p. 7.

† Ibid., p. 39.

to its use in Tertullian as a heathen custom, which could hardly have been written if in his time it was a recognised part of Christian worship. It was introduced, no doubt, for the purpose of promoting due pomp and splendour in the celebration of Divine Service; and we of the Church of England have to consider whether we have not too much neglected such outward circumstance of picturesque effect as subordinate means of attracting men to services in which they will have to listen to better things.

The use of incense is quite defensible on this lower but perfectly legitimate ground, but when any higher ground is taken it utterly breaks from under us.

It cannot be used to do honour to a special Presence, for it is used long before consecration, and the mere volume of the Gospels is incensed as well as the altar; and so far from betokening any Sacrifice of that Presence, it rather interferes with it: incense of itself being so distinctly sacrificial in its use. It must have interfered, for instance, very seriously with the sacrificial ideas of the worshipper according to the Liturgy of St. James, when he heard the priest ask God in the very same terms to accept the sacrifice of incense, and the sacrifice of those elements on which he believed the Holy Ghost was about to descend to make them the Body and Blood of Christ.

IV. With respect to the mixed chalice, two matters should, of course, be kept distinct.

1. The use of wine for consecration in which a little water has been mixed, and

2. The doing this during, and as a part of, the celebration.

The ruling of the Dean of Arches is as follows:—

> "The mingling of a little pure water with the wine is an innocent and primitive custom, and one which has been sanctioned by eminent authorities in our Church; and I do not say that it is illegal to administer to the communicants wine in which a little water has been previously mixed. My decision upon this point is, that the mixing may not take place during the service, because such mixing would be a ceremony designedly omitted in, and therefore prohibited by, the rubrics of the present Prayer-Book."

By this ruling, our practice is maintained in strict accordance with all the ancient Liturgies, in which the mixing of the cup forms no part whatsoever of the ritual of the Liturgy.

Vestments.—The more the subject of vestments is enquired into, the clearer it will be seen that, in their origin, they had no special dogmatic significance whatsoever.

Dr. Rock, the Romanist, in his 'Hierurgia,' and Mr. Marriott, the Anglican, in his 'Vestiarium Christianum,' seem at one upon this, for they both endeavour to show that the earliest vestments of the Christian ministry were identical with the "dress worn by persons of condition on occasions of joyous festival or solemn ceremonial;" and Mr. Marriott adds, "and this was a dress which in such wise differed from the habit of every-day life and ordinary wear that it was marked out plainly in the eyes of all as a garb proper to occasions of religious worship and of solemn assembly in the presence of God."

Mr. Marriott gives in illustration a number of drawings and photographs from the early Christian cemeteries. The briefest glance at these will convince the reader of two things; first, that anything like the present vestments of the Romish Celebrant were absolutely unknown for four or five centuries at least, and secondly, that the actual vestments of that period more resembled the flowing surplice and stole of an English Clergyman than anything else.

If then, as seems allowed on all hands, the early Christian vestments sprang out of the ordinary festive religious dress of the period, it must have been adopted by the Christians simply for the purpose of adding solemnity to their religious rites, and for nothing else.

It is no less clear from the remarks respecting the use of colour which we find in the earliest Fathers, notably in Clemens Alexandrinus, that they would have regarded the use of bright colours as most unsuitable because meretricious. The copies of wall paintings in the ancient Catacombs appear to place it beyond the reach of doubt that the vestments in which the earliest Christians ministered were white.

When then we are told that the revival of the use of the chasuble is needful for dogmatic purposes: as, for instance, in order to teach the Real Presence or the proper Sacrifice, we ask, Did not the Christian Church for several hundred years teach both the Presence and the Sacrifice without such a vestment?

Its origin has nothing to do with Sacrifice.

"This vestment" (as Mr. Marriott remarks) "is utterly unlike any of those of the Levitical Priesthood, and as long as the humble origin of this vestment (it was worn by peasants) was remembered in the Church, and it was regarded as common to all clerics and to monks alike as a secular dress, there was of course no special association of idea of Sacrifice with this vestment. Accordingly we find the earlier writers speaking of it as typical either of 'charity,' the symbolism which it has retained through all the later liturgical writers, or of those good works and duties which are 'common to all the clerical order, hungering, thirsting, watching, nakedness, reading, singing of psalms, prayers, activity of good works, teaching, silent meditation and the like' (Amalarius, p. 98). But as time went on and the secular dress of the clergy no longer resembled the casula in form or in name, the chasuble came to be regarded as the distinctive vestment of Christian priesthood, and therefore, according to the prevailing idea of mediæval times, became especially associated with the idea of sacrifice."

So that, looking to its origin and the earliest associations connected with it, the wide and ample surplice, as representing the flowing festive toga, teaches far more distinctly the festive and sacrificial character of the Christian mysteries than the chasuble.

One word in conclusion.

The whole question of Holy Communion is an inexpressibly serious one, for it is concerned at every point with no less a thing than the partaking in some heavenly and mysterious, but most real, way, in the Flesh and Blood of One now at the right-hand of God, and this for the purpose of bringing about His in-dwelling in the Christian.

Let us beware how we regard such a rite as a mere religious solemnity, for it is more. The associations connected with such words as "solemnity," "high function," "ceremonial," fall very far short of its reality.

Is it right, in the sight of the Great Institutor, to turn the Sacrament of His Body and Blood into a spectacle to be gazed upon by the world? If this be His will, then one thing is most certain, that our present service cannot be according to His will, and we must cast it aside altogether, and readopt, in its inte-

grity, that which 300 years ago we cast aside; for throughout our Liturgy the great memorial or commemorative act is never assumed to be performed by one man, others only looking on, and this alone prevents it from being consistently made the religious ceremonial or function which we see in some other branches of the Church.

After all, the real question is this: Is the will of the Great Institutor respecting the celebration of His memorial Communion to be found in the Missals and Ritual Directories of Mediæval Christendom? Are these so bound up with His glory that, after 300 years of desuetude, they are to be revived as far as possible, though the rending of our own Church, and the repudiation of Sacramental truth by our own nation be the result? We have men—grave, learned, devout men—who by their every argument *imply* this. Dare they *assert* it? With the account of the institution in the New Testament; with the Primitive Liturgies; with the history of the early Church in their hands, dare they assert it? The English branch of Christ's Holy Catholic Church has decided very emphatically that the words of the Mediæval Service were not acceptable to Him, for she has substituted for it a service the great bulk of which is in very different language, notwithstanding its retention of certain features common to all old offices. She was, we believe, fully justified in making this change, for, compared with the most ancient types of Liturgy, such as the Clementine and Alexandrian, the service which she has set aside is new, and hardly a "reasonable" service. Judged by its own rubrics, compared with the views of those who now use it, it is the most inconsistent service in existence.

There is only one *religious* reason why we should take Mediæval ritual as our guide, and that is, that, in so doing, we promote the union of Christendom; but are we likely to advance one step towards this by copying the mere ritual adjuncts or clothing of a service, whilst we have retained only a very small portion indeed of the *words* of that service, and materially altered its whole intention?

Rome, wherever she has had the power, has crushed out all national rites, and we cannot possibly tolerate the Roman service within our borders. The adoption of the mere ritual of such a service, whilst we reject the service itself, cannot certainly be one step towards real union.

The Communion Service of the English branch of the Church Catholic seems marked out by God's providence to be the expression of the devotion of the foremost races of the earth in their highest act of divine service. It is the rite of that branch of the Church which, whatever be its shortcomings, or scandals, seems to hold its own in the face of the spread of civilisation, and of the progress of natural science, and of the utmost latitude of thought.

Even such a Romanist as Döllinger has seen in the position and formularies of the English Church a possible opening for reunion.

Whether an union of divided Christendom will be brought about before Christ comes is known only to Him, but of this we may be assured that such an Union must be founded on His truth, and

"His Word is truth."

"Bless, O Lord, thine Holy Catholic Church, fill it with truth and grace; where it is corrupt, purge it; where it is in error, direct it; where it is superstitious, rectify it; where it is amiss, reform it; where it is right, strengthen and confirm it; where it is divided and rent asunder, heal the breaches of it, O Thou Holy One of Israel."

M. F. Sadler.

ESSAY VIII.

INDIAN MISSIONS.

By Sir BARTLE FRERE, G.C.S.I., K.C.B., D.C.L.

CONTENTS OF ESSAY VIII.

- What are Missions of our Church doing in India?
- General want of appreciation in England of the extent of Mission work, and of its results.
- What is real missionary work? and what the progress we may expect?
- They are here taken in their most extended sense.
- Other causes have contributed to the great changes which are coming over India.
- The changes amount to a revolution, not only political and material, but moral and religious.
- Retrospect—Christianity not new to India.
- It has been constantly preached in India from the earliest ages.
- Caution of the early English settlers regarding missionary work.
- This caution fortunate for the growth of political power.
- Nor less so for the advancement of spiritual Christianity.
- Change in English views regarding missionary work coincident with the progress of the revolutionary spirit in Europe, and with the establishment of our Empire in India.
- Growth of the missionary spirit.
- Comparison of Missions as they existed in 1834 and in 1869.
    - Missions of our own Church.
    - Scotch and Irish Presbyterian Churches.
    - Wesleyans and Nonconformist bodies.
    - Americans.
    - Germans.
- Syrian and other ancient Churches.
- Roman Catholics.
- Effects of Bible and Tract Societies, &c.
- General results as affecting—
    - The urban Hindoos.
    - Brahmoism.
    - Mohammedanism.
    - The non-Aryan races and rural Hindoos.
- Summary of results.
- Duties of the English Church at this crisis.
- What may our Church claim of the results of the work of other bodies?
- Advantages our Church possesses owing to its apostolical order and organization.
- Its comprehensiveness as a National Church.
- Its spirit of toleration.
- Its practical fearlessness of discussion for the discovery of truth.
- The wants of our Church.
- Glance at possible results, political and religious, to England and India.

INDIAN MISSIONS.

"WHAT are our Missions doing in India?" "Are they making any substantial progress?" "Are they really as little successful as some people tell us?"

Such are some of the questions most commonly asked of any one freshly arrived from India, by friends of our Church's Missions, and by people as well informed as their neighbours regarding what is really going on in India.

The question itself, or the tone in which it is put, generally indicates some expectation of an unfavourable answer. If the opinions of others who have been in India are quoted, they are expressive of some doubt whether much is really being done by Christian Missions in India, but especially by those of our own Church, in comparison with what is being effected by other agencies—many of them unconnected with religion.

Any such conclusion is entirely opposed to the results of my own observation and experience in various parts of India during the past thirty-five years. It may therefore interest Churchmen to know the grounds of my belief as to the extent and reality of the work which is being done by our Missions. It may also be useful to trace the causes why there should be any question, as to matters of fact; regarding which it might seem, at first sight, that there could not possibly be two opinions.

I will confine myself, as much as possible, to what I have myself seen and heard. Though almost perpetually moving about that part of the peninsula to which I was attached, during my Indian service, I cannot boast of having visited, however briefly, one-fifth of the provinces which make up the Empire—nor of knowing very intimately the circumstances of half the provinces I visited. Still my opportunities of observation were as extensive and varied as those of many men who feel authorised to speak pretty confidently as to the general success or failure of Indian Missions; I had, moreover, considerable

advantage in frequently revisiting the same spot after intervals of five, ten, or more years.

I ought, at starting, to define what I mean by "Missionary work" and "Missionary progress;" for different people, and even different Missionaries, use the words in very different senses.

All would agree that to preach the Gospel message, and to put it in the power of hearers fully to comprehend the scheme of Redemption through Christ, is Missionary work. Some might demur to include in the definition the distribution of the Scriptures so as to be within easy reach of enquirers. Many more would object to include education, unless it were exclusively and completely religious.

So, with regard to the question, What is real Missionary progress?—some would limit it to complete conversion and open profession of Christianity, to such complete and sincere abandonment of another religion as would justify the strictest Missionary in admitting the convert by Baptism into the congregation of professing Christian communicants.

I would, however, speak of Missionary progress in its least restricted sense, as including all that tends to bring the population of India generally as much within the Christian pale as are the inhabitants of Western Europe. All that tends directly and intentionally to produce this result I should regard as Missionary work.

Let us consider what change has come over the people of India, moving them in this direction. Then let us try to ascertain how much of this movement is due to the action of Christian Missions.

Of course, much of such work is done by other than Missionary agency. Anything that tends to break up old beliefs, aids, in its degree, the reception of a new creed. In this point of view, almost everything we do in India is more or less Missionary work. Not only railways and printing-presses; education, commerce, and the electric telegraph; our impartial codes, and uniform systems of administration; but our misfortunes and our mistakes, our wars, our famines and our mutinies.

It is, in truth, a perception of this fact which blinds many observers to the extent and character of the change which is taking place in matters of belief; everything in India is in a state of revolution. Happily for mankind, it is as yet peace-

able; generally silent, and often almost unnoticed; but still it is revolution—more general, more complete, and more rapid than that which is going on in Europe. Every one in India, according to his point of view, sees more or less of this change and knows something of its causes. But, unless his attention is particularly directed to the subject of religious belief, he is apt to suppose that the general change is due to that cause with which he is himself immediately connected, and to ignore all others, and especially those which, like religious dogmas, act sometimes negatively, sometimes positively, with very various effect on morals; — and which are always subtle in operation, and generally little noticeable at the outset, in comparison with the power of their ultimate operation.

Of course it is easy to say I am confounding cause with effect: that I am attributing to Luther's preaching what is really the result of the invention of printing or of the discovery of America. But, for the moment, I would not discuss the relative efficiency of causes, nor seek to assign to each agency its exact share in the work done. I would speak only of results. The Christian Missionary seeks to produce a certain result, and it is produced. Whether by his working, or by something else, we will inquire hereafter; a great religious and moral revolution is in progress, and in the first instance the fact of the result is all we are concerned with.

Let us look back for a moment, and consider what India has known of our faith, from the earliest times of authentic history. No part of it is new to India, or of merely modern introduction. There is much to give colour to the belief that the ancestors of some of the scattered communities of Israelites, on the Maharatta coast near Bombay, arrived in India, or at all events had passed beyond the limits of the Persian Empire of Xerxes, before the invasion of India by Alexander. There is a considerable population of Jews, further South, whose ancestors arrived at various subsequent periods before the Mohammedan era, bringing with them their own creed and their sacred books.

It is also clear that the Gospel of the New Testament was preached to the ancestors of these Jewish exiles, and to the heathen around them, in the earliest or Apostolic age of our era; and that numerous converts were made by those early Christian Missionaries in the maritime provinces of Southern India. From

the days of St. Thomas's immediate successors to our own, the Churches of Western Asia and Europe have ever and anon sent messengers and missionaries to India, to inquire of the welfare of their brethren in the East, or to enlighten their ignorance. The object was sufficient to interest rulers like Alfred, even in remote and, at that time, semi-barbarous corners of Christendom. We have more than one detailed and authentic record * of Missionary travel in India, during the middle ages, showing that the Missionaries found, in many parts of India, settled communities of Christians who, though sometimes terribly persecuted, still enjoyed, on the whole, a considerable amount of toleration from the Hindoo rulers of the land. As the obstacles to Oriental travel created by the growth of Mohammedanism and by the Crusades diminished, and as commerce and letters revived from the desolation which followed the overthrow of the Roman Empire, European travellers, ecclesiastics as well as laics, became more numerous. Emperors like Jehangir and Acbar welcomed them to their courts; Christian artists left their mark on Indian palaces and capitals, the Christian Scriptures found a place in more than one Royal Indian Library, and Christian morals, if not Christian doctrine, had a share in shaping Indian imperial constitutions.

The religious zeal of the Portuguese was not displayed in a fashion so much calculated to win souls to Christ after the manner of the Apostles, as to add kingdoms to Christendom after the fashion of the Crusaders. I fear there can be little doubt but that this crusading zeal of the Portuguese did far more harm than good to the cause of Christianity, but perhaps its worst result was the impression it helped to produce on the early English and Dutch adventurers, that Missionary zeal was fatal to commercial success, or to the acquisition of political influence.

The good London citizens who thought they directed the affairs of the East India Company in its infancy, sent out many a well-meant despatch, directing the Chiefs of their Factories to look after the morals of their English servants, and a frugal establishment of Chaplains was allowed to preach to them. As the great English mercantile enterprise grew into an Empire,

---

* See, for instance, the curious travels of Friar Jordanus, in the 14th century, translated by Colonel Yule for the Hakluyt Society.

Parliament from time to time paid some cautious homage to the value of religious teaching, among other responsibilities of rulers. But it cannot be denied that such duties ever held a very secondary place in the estimation of even the most thoughtful of the hard practical men who laid the foundations of our Eastern Empire. There seems to have been ever present to their minds a latent misgiving that too much thought of the things of another world was incompatible with due attention to the affairs of this, and that the extension of trade and of territorial influence were likely to suffer from over-much Missionary zeal.

And in their generation they were, no doubt, quite right. There was little of crusading zeal in the religion of ordinary Englishmen in the eighteenth century, and that little was generally drawn in other directions than towards India. Had it all been directed to Hindostan it could not, humanly speaking, have done much. But any very fervent desire to convert the Gentoos was hardly compatible with the motives which actuated most of the founders of our Indian Empire. If the hope did sometimes sanctify the dreams of men who, like Clive and Hastings, had a forecast of the real greatness of the work they had in hand, it could have little influence on the rank and file of their followers, compared with the sense of duty to their employers and country, and the love of enterprise or power which often ennobled their more selfish motives, and impelled them to the great task so many of them were almost unconsciously performing.

As far as the growth and consolidation of an empire are concerned, it is, perhaps, well that it was so. For it cannot be doubted that any well-founded suspicion that our aim was in any considerable degree the subversion of the indigenous creeds of Hindostan, and the substitution of our own, would, as far as human eye can see, have been fatal to all hopes of an Anglo-Indian Empire, almost any time during the three-quarters of a century which preceded or which followed the battle of Plassey. It would have supplied almost the only conceivable motive which could have united against us all the discordant elements of Indian political life, and would have effectually retarded that process of natural disintegration to which, more than anything else, our successes have been due.

Nor, indeed, is it probable that it would have been well for Christianity itself, had any ardent desire for its propagation mingled largely with the impulses of the early English conquerors of Hindostan.

The gold of true Christian zeal may stand much alloy with more earthly and baser motives, and be recoverable afterwards in its original purity, when tried by the most fiery of tests; but it is not improved nor increased by the process.

Whatever Christianity may be supposed to owe to Constantine, it is certainly under no great obligations to conquerors in general. Uncontrolled political power has an influence at least as corrupting as power in its baser and more concrete form of riches.

Few conquerors or autocrats can realise the Christian statesman's ideal of duty, to do as he would be done by, in politics and religion, as well as in common life. Fewer still, who feel deeply and earnestly on points of faith, when they actually possess the power to coerce or persecute, could still leave their neighbour free to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience.

The early conquerors of India were sorely tempted on every side, they were far from all control of public conscience, and were practically little responsible to any earthly tribunal. Few reflecting Christians could now wish that Clive had been actuated by the religious zeal of a John Huss or an Alva; or that later conquerors and annexationists had been advised by a Cotton Mather or a Xavier in their dealings with the crumbling kingdoms around them.

But a wonderful change was coming over the views of Englishmen with regard to Missionary work generally, about the same period that a hundred different, and often apparently discordant, causes concurred to force us into the position of the reluctant rulers of all India.

In both cases the political as well as the religious change succeeded a period of darkness and depression.

If missionary zeal was never quite extinct in any European Church during the last century it was nowhere really active; and, except for occasional evidence of life in a suffering and persecuted Church like the Moravians, it appeared to be slumbering, if not dead. Nor was it any sunshine of worldly

prosperity which at last revived or aroused it. In England the Wesleyan disruption seemed, to many minds, for a time to abstract all religious zeal from the Established Church, whilst the loss of our American colonies removed from us the fairest field for real Missionary labour which could have been presented to any nation. In Europe generally the French Revolution threatened to overwhelm all religious belief in a deluge of scepticism. Yet from that era may be dated the creation or revival of all our great religious and Missionary Societies, and the growth of those great religious parties which, all actuated by a more or less active zeal for their own view of Christianity, have together effected so much in creating and propagating an active Christian spirit throughout the world.

The movement was not confined to Great Britain. It was quite as active in every part of the Continent, which at first sight seemed most scourged by the infidel spirit of the French Revolution. There is not a province in France or Germany, Holland, Switzerland, or Belgium, which does not do more now to maintain missionaries preaching Christianity, after their own form of national belief, than all Europe could boast of before the outbreak of the French Revolution.

The zeal for Missionary enterprise which became active in England in the early part of this century was, however, long in reaching the rulers of India, in India. Able pens have recorded the history of Schwartz in Southern India and of the Serampore Brethren. They have told how, when the first avowed Protestant Missionaries arrived at Calcutta with the declared object of preaching to the heathen of Bengal, the Governor-General and his Council felt convinced, after much deliberation, that the Missionaries could not be allowed to carry out their object in British territory, and they were thus forced to betake themselves to the little Danish settlement, which has been immortalised by the hospitality it extended to the refugees.

America, too, had felt the impulse before more than one of our own English Missionary Societies* had succeeded in establishing missions in any part of India. The last American war had hardly closed when a band of humble and devoted men arrived from Boston, sent out by the American Board of Foreign

---

* The Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge is the solitary exception.

Missions, for the purpose of preaching the Gospel to the Hindoo subjects of the mother country. Nothing could more distinctly mark the strength of the dread which the then rulers of British India entertained of any Missionary proceedings, than the fact that, after anxious deliberation by Governors, Councillors, and Secretaries, many of them sincerely desirous to welcome the Missionary strangers, they were solemnly warned off the British territory, and effectually expelled from it, as likely to be dangerous to the public peace. Some of them never returned; but one little band made a second attempt. They preferred an earnest appeal to Sir Evan Nepean, the Governor of Bombay. He had been Dundas' most trusted subordinate at the Admiralty, and Under-Secretary throughout much of the Revolutionary War. The Americans appealed to him not as a statesman but as Vice-President of the then newly-established Bible Society. They had a good friend in his Assistant-Secretary, the late Robert Cotton Money, a young man as remarkable for his prudence as for his fervent piety; and at length, after much misgiving as to the possible mischief they might do in the country, and many well-meant warnings to be most circumspect in their conduct, they were allowed to remain.*

Meantime many devoted men from Scotland, Ireland, Wales, and Germany, had followed these first pioneers from England and America to establish Protestant Missions, and Rome had sent forth men of almost all European nations on a similar errand.

But the last thirty-five years have been emphatically the era of revolution in India.

To judge how the revolution has affected Mission work, it may be well, in the first instance, to fix our attention on some area less than the whole continent. Let us consider the condition of that portion of Western India of which Bombay may be regarded as the centre.

A line beginning at the north of Sind, on our western frontier, some 400 miles from the sea, and continuing in a semicircular direction at the same average distance from the coast, to a point due east of Bombay, and thence curving

---

* The last survivor of the little band, the Rev. Mr. Graves, was still actively at work when I first arrived in India in 1834, and continued at his post till his death in 1848.

westward to the coast 400 miles south of Bombay, will about indicate the area.

We have had a footing there longer than in any other part of India. In Charles the Second's reign we acquired a strong naval and commercial position by the cession from the Portuguese of Bombay, one of the best natural harbours in Asia.

How in the early years of our rule our predecessors on the western coast lived, traded, and intrigued, has been graphically told* from the records of those days. Mr. Anderson's work was prematurely cut short; but he who would know from what small beginnings empires grow—how the seeds of a great Power may for ages lie dormant, and how they may shoot forth and flourish, after having long seemed hopelessly dead and corrupt—will do well to consult his pages.

The western coast was the scene of some of the early exploits of Clive and Watson. Among the powers which ruled on the mainland, Wellington made his first essays in command of armies, and his letters, written in those commands, still form the best manual from which a soldier may learn how to conquer in countries like India. Munro, Malcolm, and Elphinstone, in the same school, administered what they had helped to conquer, and left lessons how so to rule India as to make the dominion of foreign conquerors respected as well as beloved by subject races. Nor have they ever wanted worthy successors. Few could surpass Napier as the sagacious and far-sighted ruler of the kingdom his sword had won. But Western India has produced many who showed, like the great men I have named, almost equal genius for the arts of peace and war. Some, like John Jacob, hardly achieved more than a great local reputation, but Outram's services as a philanthropist and civiliser, not less than his valour as a soldier, have won for him a place by the side of the warriors and statesmen whose names the nation has immortalised in Westminster Abbey.

For a century and a half, though our influence gradually increased, the actual growth of our empire on the western coast was almost imperceptible; but during the first fifty years of the present century our frontier extended with unexampled

---

* 'The English in Western India,' by the Rev. Philip Anderson, A.M., Chaplain on the Bombay Establishment, 2nd edit., Smith and Elder, London, 1856.

rapidity. An officer* who in 1808 served on outpost duty at Tanna, twenty miles north of Bombay, then the northern frontier of the British possessions in Western India, lived to command, fifty years later, as brigadier at Peshawur, a frontier station more than a thousand miles, as the crow flies, in advance of his quarters as an ensign; almost the whole of the intermediate territory had in the mean time fallen under the rule, more or less direct, of the British Crown.

Commerce meantime throve apace. From a small and unhealthy fishing-town, Bombay grew, during the naval wars of the last century, to be the Halifax of the East. Since then it has rapidly increased in importance, till now it numbers more inhabitants than any city in the British Empire, London alone excepted, and no English port out of the British islands carries on a larger foreign commerce.

And what, during these 200 years, has been the progress made by the Gospel in these parts?

Early in Queen Anne's days a zealous chaplain† took advantage of a genial Christmas gathering of the settlers, and got the Governor to lay the foundation stone of the first English Protestant church built in India. He records how he planned, and, what is more, completed the edifice, of proportions suited to the dignity he hoped it would one day assume as the cathedral of a Protestant Anglo-Indian Diocese. His hopes were not disappointed, for it is now the cathedral of the Diocese of Bombay; but it was a century and a quarter ere a bishop was appointed to the diocese, and took his seat in the cathedral the good chaplain had designed for him, and which Middleton more than a century afterwards had consecrated.

In 1834 the total strength of the Protestant Ecclesiastical Establishment was as follows:—

Of the Established Church of England and Ireland there were an archdeacon and 13 Government Chaplains, who officiated at the chief civil and military stations, and there were two chaplains of the Established Kirk of Scotland stationed in Bombay similarly employed. The Scotch Kirk had also three Missionaries stationed at Bombay, at Hurnee (a small station on the coast), and at Poona.

---

* Colonel Douglas.

† The Rev. Mr. Cobbe.

The Societies for Promoting Christian Knowledge, and for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts had committees, but no Missions or Missionaries. The Church Missionary Society had two ordained Missionaries stationed at Nassick, about eighty miles off.

The London Missionary Society had four Missionaries resident at Surat and Belgaum.

The American Maharatta Mission, established in 1813 by the American Board of Foreign Missions, had six ordained missionaries and three lay helpers at Bombay and Ahmednuggur.

Altogether the Protestant ordained clergy numbered, in Western India, 16 Military Chaplains and 15 ordained Missionaries, of various denominations, at seven stations.

A branch of the Bible Society had translated and printed portions of the Scripture into Maharatta and Guzeratti, the two languages commonly spoken near Bombay, and a single gospel into the dialect of Cutch.

There was also a Tract and Book Society.

Of the Roman Catholic Clergy it is difficult to give accurate statistics. There was no bishop or vicar apostolic resident at Bombay in 1834. A few Dominicans and other regulars, chiefly English, Irish, French, or Italians, had Missionary duties at stations where British troops were quartered, and ministered to the soldiers. But the whole territory formed part of the Portuguese Archbishopric of Goa, and, by treaty with the Crown of Portugal, all the rights and jurisdiction of the Portuguese archbishop and his clergy as they existed in Charles II.'s time, were to be respected by the British. In or about Bombay there was a considerable remnant of the native Churches converted by the Portuguese in earlier days, and divided into regular parishes, with priests of their own, generally educated at Goa.

It can hardly be said, however, that, in 1834, any special Mission to the unconverted natives was actively maintained by the Church of Rome in Western India.

Such, after we had held our political position on that coast for a century and three-quarters, and our commercial establishments for much longer, was the numerical strength of the Missionary army which was to attempt to convert to Christianity many nations, considerably exceeding in numbers the population of all Italy, and professing creeds of which Mohammedanism

was one of the most modern, while others could boast that they were old beliefs, and were professed by civilised and conquering races, when Alexander invaded India.

Nor was the prospect much more encouraging for the Missionaries when the work was looked at more closely. In the Established Church the chaplains were pretty fully occupied with their own duties to the European soldiers. Some of them* were actuated by a very active Missionary zeal, but, as a rule, the pastoral charge of 1000 or more men, with their wives and families, hospitals and schools, and two or more full services every Sunday, was found fully to occupy their time.

The two Missionaries maintained by the Church Missionary Society were stationed at Nassick, a very sacred town, on a very sacred river, about 100 miles from Bombay, the head-quarters of Brahmanism in that part of India, and to all appearance one of the most bigoted and least impressible places, within many hundred miles. The great majority of Europeans who heard or cared anything about them (and they were not many), according to their views regarding Missions generally, ridiculed or pitied them; those who knew the country best, shook their heads at the notion of attacking Brahmanism at its head-quarters. "The people there were the most bigoted and best instructed in their own learning of all that part of Hindostan. As dialecticians or Sanscrit scholars, the Missionaries were no match for them. To cope with the learned Shastris would puzzle the greatest scholars of Europe; and moderately educated clergymen had no chance with them. They would have done better to devote their energies to some simple rural population." If the Missionaries themselves had any great hopes of success, they said not much about it to the world in general. There was little, if any, direct result to be seen from their teaching or preaching as far as the genuine Hindoo population about them was concerned; but they worked steadily at their schools, their preaching and their translations, lived lives which were a visible missionary sermon, and hoped for better things to come.

---

* Such were the Archdeacon (afterwards Bishop) Carr and his son-in-law, the late Rev. W. K. Fletcher, who, like the Henry Martyns, Thomasons, and Corries of Bengal, ever regarded mission work as an essential part of their pastoral duties.

The Kirk of Scotland had shortly before sent out a man who will be remembered among the Christian apostles of Western India. Dr. John Wilson possessed in an eminent degree all the typical excellencies and powers of a highly educated Scotch clergyman. He neglected no branch of human learning which came in his way. Classical and Oriental scholars, philologists and antiquaries, geologists, and politicians, all lamented that he did not pay exclusive attention to their own favourite branch of study; but none could complain of him as negligent or indifferent. All his human learning, however, was devoted to the Missionary cause, and mainly to education, which he believed was intended to be the chief handmaid of Missionary work in India. And all his proceedings were directed with a prudence, judgment, and consistent perseverance, which is rare in any profession. But in 1834 he was only lately arrived, and the Educational Institute of the General Assembly to which he chiefly devoted his energies was yet in its infancy.

The Missionaries of other Churches were in much the same state as those of the Established Church. The Europeans around them regarded them sometimes with sympathy, or with compassion; but generally with indifference, often verging on ridicule in the more thoughtless; as well-meaning enthusiasts, who were working at impossibilities; none of them could or did boast much visible fruit to his labours.

The Americans, simple, retiring, and somewhat austere, as might be expected in men to whom the memory of their Pilgrim Fathers is sacred, had fresh in their minds the difficulties raised by the Anglo-Indian Government in admitting them to land at all in India; and were reserved in speaking to strangers of their prospects of success. They had, like all Americans, great faith in the efficacy of education, and in the use of the press as an engine of education. Their schools were models in their way, and were well attended, their printing presses were far in advance of any similar establishments in India, and the publications which issued from them excellent in weighty matter as well as in typography.

From the first they paid peculiar attention to the lower orders, whether from any early perception of the ethnological peculiarities which render those classes in some respects more accessible to Christian truth, or simply from sympathy with a

down-trodden race. But this did not impress many men of great Indian experience and worldly wisdom with any favourable opinion of their prospects of success. "It was a mistake to think that much general impression on the great mass of Hindoo society would ever be produced by converting a few low-caste people here and there. The effect must be rather unfavourable on the better classes, who were already too apt to think that Christianity was a synonym for one of the most degraded castes, and that the habits of Christians accorded only with the tastes of the lowest of Hindoos. The same amount of labour and learning would be much better applied in trying to make an impression on one Brahman than on a dozen men of inferior caste."

It would not, in truth, have been easy at that time for the Missionary to satisfy any man of merely worldly prudence or wisdom that his attempt was not a very hopeless one. "Our views of Christianity had been before these natives of India for one or two centuries, and what was the result? Here and there an intellectual giant, like Ramahoun Roy, might have emancipated himself from the grosser forms of idolatry, and gone over to pure theism—or a poor wretch who had no previous knowledge of any religion, and had nothing to lose in this world or the next, might be converted and make as good a Christian as any converted pauper in Europe—but, as a system, Hindooism was impenetrable and immoveable. It had lasted two or three thousand years, and seemed likely to last two or three thousand more."

"And what was true of Hindooism was even more applicable to Mohammedanism, and other forms of Oriental belief. Had we ever heard of any real effect from Western preaching or teaching on Eastern forms of thought? In this, as in other respects, the East was unchangeable," &c., &c.

While this was the general feeling of Europeans who were not averse to Christianity in their own persons and family, but who merely lacked any strong faith in its inherent power, or in the promises of its Founder, it can hardly be expected that the native community generally, should have had any strong expectation that this preaching by solitary Missionaries scattered here and there among hundreds of thousands of men of other creeds, could have much effect.

There were at that time and long after, many among the natives who still feared that religion might be made a political question; that the English merely bided their time, and would some day appear in their true colours as iconoclasts, like the Mohammedans of former days; or as Crusaders, like the Portuguese of more recent memory. They could not quite believe that we were all Atheists or Gallios; still less could they conceive the feeling of Christian zeal and love such as produces fervent desire for the conversion of all the world; joined to that feeling of toleration which will not allow a man conscious of worldly power to use it for purposes of spiritual proselytism.

Natives who reflected on such things in those days were sorely puzzled to understand either the professed views of the Government, or what they could see of the motives of Missionaries.

But, as a general rule, the native population regarded the Missionaries with indifference if not contempt. Sometimes, though very rarely, an instance of imprudent zeal might rouse a Brahmanical or Mohammedan mob; but generally they looked on the Missionaries as harmless, well-meaning enthusiasts, who had a craze for preaching and distributing tracts; not bad people by any means, and often entitled to respect, if not on their own account, at least from the weight their opinions seemed to carry with officials, and not for any reason to be much feared.

Let us suppose that some thirty-five years have passed. The British frontier has vastly extended, and is now identical with that of India. Not only has kingdom after kingdom fallen to the British Crown, some by conquest after war, some in default of heirs who could enforce their claims, some by way of punishments for misdeeds of rulers. But all, as it were, in spite of ourselves. No Semiramis has been reigning over a nation of conquerors, but a sovereign who would not willingly have shed a drop of innocent blood to gain ten kingdoms. Nor were the people, as a mass, bent on conquest. It is true that, as of old, ten of them would sometimes chase a thousand, and the fiercest and best disciplined warriors of Asia were in vain hurled in thousands against comparative handfuls of these stiff Britons, buttoned up in red-coats and accoutred as if with the intention

of preventing their being mischievous in war. But the people of England, who thought they directed everything throughout the empire by means of an assembly sitting in London, seemed by no means prone to conquest. In all sincerity they sent out the most imperative orders to their officers in India to conquer no more; but somehow their orders were never obeyed, even by men who wished to obey. The people of England, however, gave no great encouragement to the unwilling conquerors. They sometimes growled out thanks for what they seemed to regard as an involuntary service, and an unintended gift of empire; but they often reviled their benefactor as though they thought him an unwilling or disobedient servant, and if they put up a statue to him when he was dead, were very apt to neglect him while he lived.

Even defeats and misfortunes helped somehow to extend the empire. Once our armies set out with great pomp, attacked a warlike and independent people dwelling beyond the natural boundaries of India, and established themselves firmly in Affghanistan, in a position which seemed to dominate over Persia and Central Asia, and effectually to screen India from all risk of invasion. We appeared for the moment to have everything very much our own way in Asia, when suddenly, without any very visible external cause, the whole fabric beyond our Indian border seemed to melt away. The country which had been so easily overrun rose against us—a strong army, powerfully posted, was destroyed as by magic. The demon of misfortune and mismanagement seemed to pursue us. Everything went wrong, and though instances of heroism and conduct in individual garrisons and detachments consoled the nation by showing we had not lost the elements of national glory, the net result was a humiliation so serious that it seemed for the moment to shake the very foundations of our dominion.

They, however, who thought our power in India was on the wane were speedily undeceived. Within a few years after our Affghan reverses, three great and warlike nations suffered defeat, and if our conquests in Affghanistan were lost as suddenly as they had been acquired, we learnt some valuable lessons of wisdom by misfortune, and our position in India was on the whole greatly strengthened by our reverses.

But in 1857 a mutiny and rebellion broke out in India, so

great and wide-spread that superficial observers at first began to think the empire was lost. It was, in truth, a calamity of the nature of those which destroy empires. But in this instance it seemed, when the crisis was over, only to consolidate and confirm. What was feeble gave way, and was removed. What was strong had its strength severely tried, and, if it stood the test, was all the more trustworthy. When the crisis was past, the general strength and stability of the empire was evidently greater than before.

Among many things which contributed to this result, was a proclamation declaring the Queen's supremacy over India as over the rest of the British Empire. It was necessary to issue some public notification of the kind, to mark the termination of the trusts which, more or less for some two and a half centuries, had been vested in the East India Company to govern India on behalf of the Crown and people of England. So this proclamation was issued. It was a state-paper full of weighty thoughts and carefully-considered expressions, and struck all men as singularly well-fitted for the occasion. Englishmen regarded it with varied feelings of general approbation, though, more or less, as a matter of course. But on the natives throughout India it produced an unexpectedly profound impression. For the first time the embodiment of the authority which had grown up among them so gradually as to be almost unperceived, became visible and audible, and spoke to them in words parental in their expression of affection as well as of authority. The immediate effect on the native mind resembled nothing so much as the revelation of one of the Homeric Divinities to some assemblage of ancient Greece; but the effect did not speedily pass away. From that day the people of India recognised an authority common alike to themselves and their conquerors, an authority which acknowledged duties and responsibilities as well as powers, and avowed an intention not to evade the one nor to abdicate the other.

From that day India seemed finally to acquiesce in the conviction which had been gradually coming over her, that to be ruled by England was her destiny. There was no lack of rebellious or impatient spirits, but for the time they yielded to Fate, and there was general submission to what all seemed to regard as inevitable.

And what, during the interval of thirty-five years, had been the progress of the Christian Churches?

In the Established Church the Archdeacon and thirteen Chaplains of 1834 had increased to a Bishop with an Archdeacon and twenty-nine Chaplains and Assistant-Chaplains. But the increase was not more than proportioned to the great increase of territory and the addition to the number of Stations, so that the working strength of the Government clergy was still far from equal to the work to be done.

The same remark applies to the Established Kirk of Scotland, the Ministers of which had become four in place of two, as in 1835.

As to Missions maintained by the Church of England, the two ordained Missionaries employed by the Church Missionary Society in 1834 had become (including Missionaries of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel) twenty-six in 1868, of whom two were natives. They occupied fourteen Head-Quarter Stations, and were aided by between sixty and seventy lay teachers and catechists, and had collected a Native Church of about 1000 baptized members.

The increase in the Missionary Agency employed in Western India in 1868 by Churches other than the Established Church of England, as compared with 1831, may be thus summarised numerically.

The Presbyterian Churches in Scotland had—	In 1831.	In 1868.
Mission Societies at work*	1	2
Missionaries	3	12
The Irish Presbyterian Church had—		
Missionaries	none	6
Stations	none	5

---

* The first public profession of Christianity by pupils of good social position who had been educated at the General Assembly's Institution caused great excitement throughout the whole native community of Bombay: a serious breach of the peace was apprehended when the case was brought before the Supreme Court by a writ of habeas corpus addressed to the Missionaries. The case, however, was calmly and deliberately argued, and decided, after the fashion of such English Courts, on the dry point of the age or nonage of the converts, and their competence to judge fo themselves in matters of conscience and religion. The result was a fresh instance of the efficacy of such appeals to reason and settled law. Notwithstanding the angry passions excited, the native community submitted to the judgment, which was in favour of the converts' right to choose, being of full age, their own religion; and since then no conversion has occasioned more than a transient and partial feeling of excitement in the native community.

	In 1834.	In 1868.
The United Presbyterian Churches had—		
Missionaries	none	10
Stations	none	5
Welsh Wesleyans had—		
Missionaries	none	3
Stations	none	2
The London Missionary Society and kindred Nonconformist Churches had—		
Stations	2	4
Missionaries	1	6
The Basle and other German Missionaries had in the southern provinces of Bombay—		
Stations		7
Missionaries		10
The American Churches employed *—		
Missionaries	6	22
Lay-Helpers	3	10
Principal Stations	2	12
Circles organized as separate Churches	,,	23
They had—		
Baptized Members who were only admitted after a very rigid probation	,,	1200
Common Schools where Christian children, or children of Christian parents only, were received ..	,,	30
Higher School	,,	1
The Church of Rome, besides the indigenous agency employed under the Portuguese Archbishop of Goa, had established, under a Vicar-Apostolic with episcopal powers, Missionaries of orders not previously engaged in that part of India.		
They had—		
Missionary Priests	,,	52
Convents with large and admirably-managed Orphanages	,,	3

---

* The American Mission have been the means of bringing to Bombay a man who has made practical proof of a method of Missionary labour, which, though often suggested as an alternative for that commonly pursued, has rarely been attempted, and never with greater self-denial and devotion. For many years past, the Rev. Mr. Bowen has lived, in a crowded native bazaar, a life such as no hermit in a Libyan desert or Hindoo ascetic in a jungle solitude could surpass in its simple unaffected austerity. Labouring with his own hands in editing and printing a religious periodical, after earning the barest subsistence according to the strictest Hindoo idea of sufficiency, he has devoted his whole time to preach the Gospel in the bazaars of the native town. When questioned as to the result of his own labours, he is apt to speak of them as though they had not yielded any harvest of results visible to mortal eye. But no one who remembers the reception given to a Missionary street preacher 30 years ago, and contrasts it with the reverence shown for Mr. Bowen by crowds who acknowledge none of the truths he preaches, can fail to be struck by the deep impression his conduct, if not his words, has made.

In the extreme South there have been, for many years past, signs of an awakening among the Christians whose forefathers were almost the earliest converts to Christianity in India, and who are still in direct communication with the Syrian Churches. Sometimes the Reformers within these Churches seemed inclined to seek more intimate communion with the English Church, and I have seen a Syrian Bishop admitted to assist the late Bishops Wilson and Carr, at an ordination in one of our own cathedrals.

It would be interesting to know more of what is actually passing within these ancient Indian Churches which trace their descent from the converts of St. Thomas and St. James. At present we know but little, and that only relates to their external history, from which it is, however, clear that they have not been insensible to the impulses which have of late years stirred every Church in Indian Christendom.

Space does not admit of more than the briefest possible allusion to the work of the Bible Society and of numerous Societies for providing books and tracts and Christian literature of every kind, which have sprung up and become active in Western India during the past thirty or forty years. Good translations of the entire Bible have been made into the three principal languages, through which the Scriptures are accessible in print to at least twenty-five millions of people. The more important books of the Bible, and many Christian tracts, are now procurable in most of the dialects spoken within the portion of Western India to which we are now more immediately referring, and the number of such publications is daily increasing.

It is not easy to estimate the exact effect produced by the general cheap circulation of the Christian canonical books and other literature, apart from the preaching and *vivâ voce* explanations of the Missionaries. But any one, who is at the pains to inquire, will speedily be satisfied that the effect is so considerable as almost to justify the expressions of those who talk as if nations could be evangelized simply by the circulation of the printed Scriptures.

Missionaries and others are frequently startled by discovering persons, and even communities, who have hardly ever seen and perhaps never heard an ordained Missionary, and who have nevertheless made considerable progress in Christian knowledge,

obtained through the medium of an almost haphazard circulation of tracts and portions of Scripture.

In one instance, which I know was carefully investigated, all the inhabitants of a remote village in the Deccan had abjured idolatry and caste, removed from their temples the idols which had been worshipped there time out of mind, and agreed to profess a form of Christianity which they had deduced for themselves from a careful perusal of a single Gospel and a few tracts. These books had not been given by any Missionary, but had been casually left with some clothes and other cast-off property by a merchant, whose name even had been forgotten, and who, as far as could be ascertained, had never spoken of Christianity to his servant, to whom he gave at parting these things with others of which he had then no further need.

That an inquisitive and intelligent though very simple people, who have few books of their own, and whose recognised indigenous teachers rarely attempt any very earnest instruction in their own religion, should readily read anything that came in their way regarding the religion of their rulers, is not more than might be naturally expected. But we must go to countries in the condition of India and China at this moment to see at work the process of elaborating from a few tracts so read, a system of Theology powerful enough to set aside an ancient and well-established creed. The process is no new one. But it is only rarely, and at a special crisis in the intellectual life of a nation, that such a phenomenon is to be observed.

From the bare statistical facts, above given, a notion may be formed of the increase which took place in the agency employed by Christian Missions in Western India between 1834 and 1868, and some sort of estimate of the work they are doing. If these figures and results were multiplied six or seven times they would give a general idea of the increase which has taken place during the same period in all India.

But in every one of the great divisions of the empire there have appeared phenomena connected with the growth of Missions which are peculiar or exceptional, either from their character or magnitude.

Thus, in Madras, active Missions to the Heathen had been commenced by Protestant Missionaries at the beginning of the 18th century—many years earlier than in any other part of

India. After more than one generation of labour by very devoted men, the impression made seemed so small as almost to drive the Missionaries to despair of success in the apparently ungenial soil selected for their labours. Yet, after a while, a great movement took place; the natives were converted, in the course of a few years, by tens of thousands, and native churches, almost independent of further aid from without, have grown up not singly but by tens and scores.

In Bengal, where the work commenced a little later, but on a larger scale and with a better organization, the results of the labours of men like Carey, Marshman, Ward, and Duff, have been equally great in other ways, and, from their proximity to the capital of India, they have told on more influential classes, and over a wider area.

To Dr. Duff's energetic, eloquent, and most persistent advocacy of the system of offering to the natives the best possible education in English, is more particularly due that singular movement which, under one form or another, as Vedantism or Brahmoism, has completely changed the relations of the best educated youth of Bengal towards the religion of their ancestors as well as towards that of their present rulers. Nor is it easy to over-estimate the importance of labours like those of the Rev. J. Long in addressing the popular mind of the Bengalees through their own vernacular language.

Close to Bengal the German Missions to the Koles of Chota Nagpoor have numbered their converts by tens of thousands within a single generation after the Mission was first planted, and in no part of India does the process of conversion appear to have had so marked and general a good effect on the moral and material prosperity of the people—nowhere has the adoption of Christianity had so much the appearance of a national movement.

We ought, perhaps, hardly to except even Burma, where the American Missions seem to have effected the conversion of the Karens and other tribes by whole villages and tribes at once.

In Bombay and Western India the efforts of the Scotch Free Kirk Missions, under Dr. John Wilson, to bring the results of Western civilisation to bear on the intellectual leaders of native thought, through the means of a thoroughly sound English education, have had an effect as great as the labour of Dr. Duff and his

fellow-missionaries in Bengal; and there have been peculiarities in the work of Dr. Wilson which render it especially interesting. Among the classes to whom he has addressed himself are the energetic, liberal-minded, and practical Parsees — the various classes of Maharatta and Guzeratti Brahmans and Purvoes, all specially important from their diverse intellectual capabilities, besides communities of Jews whose future history promises to be full of interest for their Christian brethren. He has also paid special attention to more than one of the numerous jungle tribes of the Western coast.

The history of the American Missions in Bombay presents many features of the highest importance. The Missionaries have, of late years, abandoned general secular education as a Missionary work; they have concentrated their efforts on a limited tract of country, and have addressed themselves to the lower rather than to the higher classes of society, and their success has been every way most striking.

In the Punjab, also, there are symptoms of a movement, not by individuals but by communities.

Statistical facts, however, can in no way convey any adequate idea of the work done in any part of India. The effect is often enormous where there has not been a single avowed conversion, and is manifested in very different ways, according to the nationality, the creed, and even the professions in life, and place of residence, urban or rural, of the native community.

But it can hardly be estimated without a glance at what has, during the same period of time, been going on within the Christian Churches themselves.

Not one of the Churches which sends Missionaries to India occupies precisely the same position, with regard to the rest of Christendom, which it did forty years ago; and any change which takes place within the parent Church in the West, tells on its Missions much more directly and rapidly now than was the case formerly.

Our own Church has passed through the ordeal of what is called the Tractarian movement. The old landmarks of the High and Low Churches, as they existed fifty years ago, are no longer to be found in their old places—the shibboleths of partisanship are much changed, a Ritualistic and a Broad Church have grown up and trenched considerably on both the great Church

parties of the last generation. Zealous men talk as if the seamless garment were hopelessly rent in innumerable fragments, and as if all fixed standards of belief were abolished. But to one who returns after a long absence from England, and anxiously looks for the signs of permanent growth or decay, there appears much more ground for hope than for misgiving. If population in England has greatly increased, and if luxury, poverty, and many forms of vice, have increased with it, the net balance seems far from unfavourable to vital religion. Churches, pastors, services, and all means of grace connected with the Established Church, have increased in far greater ratio than the population. If there are more men who are sceptical on many points of great, it may be of vital, importance, there seem fewer in a state of pure formalism, of virtual heathenism, and of practical unbelief. If increasing numbers claim to regulate their own conduct and belief by no other rule than that which their own consciences approve, there also appears a vast increase in the proportion of those who seek to enlighten their consciences by personal prayer and communion with the Almighty, by earnest study of His Word, and by habitual reference to those few and simple articles of belief which formed the staple of the teaching by the Sea of Galilee, and of Apostolic preaching from St. Paul's at Damascus to St. John's in Patmos, and regarding which universal Christendom, as distinguished from other religions, has hitherto been at one.

There has been an extraordinary development of active Missionary energy at the same time. The Missionary efforts made during the past thirty years would alone, in the eyes of any impartial observer, be sufficient to prove the great internal vitality of the Church and its system.

If we look to Scotland, the impression left is much the same. The Disruption, which seemed to threaten the existence of the great Presbyterian Church a generation ago, has certainly infused new life into a body nowise deficient before in vigorous vitality; nor does there appear to be the slightest reason to fear that Scotland collectively will in future exercise less influence in Christendom or in Heathendom than she has at any time since the days of John Knox.

If we turn to the great Nonconformist bodies in either king-

dom, we do not find any symptoms of diminished strength, nor any complaints of impaired vitality. If the removal of political tests and disabilities has lessened the necessity for what may be called the outward uniform of the Nonconformist champions, if there is less care to mark separation of opinion by differences in architecture, in manner, in dress, in language, and other externals and non-essentials, and less bitterness, in feeling as well as in expression, there is no evidence of any inclination to compromise in matters of principle. There is even, if possible, a stronger assertion than formerly of all rights of private judgment, and increased disinclination to admit of external interference in matters spiritual. Somewhat of the old Puritanical sternness may have departed, but only because the position assumed is now felt to be too strong to be assailed.

There appears equally little external evidence of decaying vitality in the great Church which owns Rome as its centre. She is still described by her votaries as unchanged and unchangeable. But to those without her pale, a revolution which, to some of them, bears all the appearance of incipient reformation, seems to have begun within the last forty years, which may very materially alter her position as one of the greatest Churches of Christendom, but which meanwhile denotes no decay of vital force.

Losses in some of her ancient dominions are compensated by gains elsewhere; and they are not acquisitions of dead spiritless matter, but rather of elements which, however foreign to the general leaning of her teaching for centuries past, are not likely to remain dormant or inactive.

How they may modify her action is still to be seen.

That she will continue the Church of those to whom sacerdotal authority is, above all other elements, essential in religion, is compatible with many imaginable changes. The revolution may be in the direction contemplated by her rulers when they selected the reactionary path on which they are entering; or it may be that to which experience would point as more likely to result, from the strange allies who have been brought in, ostensibly to aid the backward movement.

But whatever the result, there is certainly no symptom of weakness or wavering in her Missionary work. Since the days of the Crusaders the spirit of proselytism has never been more

developed than of late years in the Missionaries sent out by Rome, and those directed to the East are in no way inferior in numbers or energy to those who are sent to other portions of her field of labour.

Thus, to whatever part of the Christian camp our attention is directed, the same result of increased activity and evidence of vitality is apparent. Comparing the attitude which Christendom now generally assumes towards those who are openly or secretly hostile to Christianity, with the general attitude of forty years back, the change is that from the camp asleep at midnight to the host mustering for the hour of battle.

It is true that myriads of formidable enemies and dangers, unseen and undreamed of during the hours of darkness and repose, now appear to threaten the position, and many of them are formidable enough to appal even the most confident. Many waverers are still in doubt which side to choose. Many discords exist among the most faithful divisions of the champions of the Cross—many jealousies among their leaders, which may give fatal openings to the foe. But all are alert, and few seek to shun the shock of battle.

No human eye can foresee the result, nor judge whether it will be more or less decisive than that of any previous conflict during thousands of years past; but there is no apparent falling off in the numbers or energy of those who have for their watchword the cause of God and His Christ.

In the East the same spirit is manifested, with the same varying characteristics, by the different bodies of Missionaries who have been sent forth by all the Western Churches. It is everywhere an active advancing spirit, urging those who are animated by it to go on conquering and to conquer. Whatever its difficulties and discouragements, it shows no disposition to retreat or act on the defensive, and the measure of its success has in the last generation been neither small nor doubtful.

Let us look more narrowly at the effect produced on the various divisions of those who are arrayed on the other side in opposition to Christianity.

As already stated, the effect varies so much, according to the race, the creed, the profession in life, and the residence of those to whom the Missionaries address themselves, that it is almost impossible to generalise.

It is necessary to select a few typical instances; and one of the most prominent in many ways, and for many reasons, as relating to the effect on urban Hindoos, is presented by the Brahmoism of Bengal. This sect—if the professors of Brahmoism can be called a sect—may be regarded as an example of the effect of Christian teaching on those classes which have for ages monopolized the learned professions in India, and which, till within the last generation, had almost exclusive possession of the keys of learning, and of all but the barest rudiments of education.

Brahmoism is of very modern growth.

We have hardly yet got out of the habit of regarding Hindooism, the most protean and varying of religions, as something stereotyped and unchangeable. But general readers about India will know that the Archaic Hindooism of the Vedas was something very different from that of the Hindoos who lived in the days when Buddhism and Brahmanism contended for supremacy. They also know that the Brahmanism which obtained the mastery, and almost annihilated Buddhism in Hindostan some eight or ten centuries ago, was again very different from that Brahmanism which our ancestors found existing in Bengal, modified as that had been, in the interval, by the more modern Puranic additions, and by the influence of several ages of Mohammedan rule.

This form of Brahmanism had, less than a century ago, every prospect of a prolonged tenure of power in Bengal. It was hedged round with restrictions of caste, and with monopolies in all the principal professions and means of employment known in Bengal, from the highest to the lowest, which went far to stereotype and fossilise all social life.

The English Government and the commercial community of those early days seemed equally indisposed to disturb a condition of things which rendered foreign rule almost an inevitable necessity, and which did not, at first sight, appear unfavourable to commerce.

It was not in the nature of things that a community, which represented, however imperfectly, the laws and constitution, the religion and civilisation, of England in the 18th century, should be placed in the midst of Bengal, without powerfully affecting the intellectual and moral condition of the Ben-

galees, who yield to no people of the ancient or modern civilised world in their natural fondness and aptitude for the discussion of theology, morals, and all that relates to the theory of social government.

But the change, which might have been long deferred had the British Government or mercantile community of that day alone been consulted, was precipitated by two knots of men, with whose action neither statesmen nor merchants had much to do.

A Northamptonshire Baptist shoemaker, joined by a few men as earnest as himself, but not much richer in worldly goods than the fishermen of Galilee, succeeded in establishing themselves as Christian Missionaries close to the British capital of Bengal; and there, in spite of very active opposition from the British Government, and very serious discouragements of every kind, they set up printing presses, translated the Christian Scriptures into many Indian languages, printed and distributed them, and sent forth from their presses English and native newspapers and periodicals, which, if they were not the first of their kind published in India, speedily surpassed all others in excellence in their several departments.

These men were not actually the first Protestant Missionaries who preached in India, for they had been preceded by Danes, Germans, and Englishmen, who, however few in number, had from the beginning of the last century never left India without some witness of Christian truth, as taught by the Protestant Churches of Europe; but to Carey, Marshman, and Ward, and their fellow-labourers, belongs, beyond all question, the honour of establishing the first Missions, after the pattern of which such a multitude have since overspread India, and they in no small degree contributed to that wonderful revival of the Missionary spirit in modern Europe dating from the same era as the French Revolution.

About the time that these men began to make themselves heard in the neighbourhood of Calcutta, a great internal movement was taking place within the strictest sect of Bengal Brahmanism.

The movement was led by Rajah Ramahoun Roy, a man who would have been remarkable in any age and in any country for intellectual power and wise patriotism, joined to an unusual gift of clear practical common sense: perhaps the rarest of all

qualities in men who habitually see far in advance of their contemporaries.

He speedily became the leader of a small but influential band of the best educated and most intellectual of his countrymen, who were all more or less affected by the influence which Christianity was already beginning to exert, though often feebly, and in a manner rather indicating repulsion from, than attraction to, the religion of the Western races.

These Hindoo reformers generally began with an attack on some part of Christianity or its adjuncts; but the more they discussed, the less they seemed satisfied with the position of the great body of their fellow-countrymen, and the result was that they gradually built up for themselves new forms of Hindooism, which to bystanders appeared totally unlike anything that had ever been derived from Hindoo sources before, and which the reformers vainly hoped might prove permanent as well as orthodox.

First, they attempted, by rejecting all modern additions and developments, to revert to those pure precepts of monotheistic Hindooism which they imagined were to be found in the Vedas, the most ancient of their own Scriptures.

Few possessed, and fewer still could read or understand, these ancient writings; and, for a while, the early Hindoo reformers of the present century seem to have convinced themselves that everything commending itself to their own reason and conscience would be found in their Vedas.

But they speedily became aware that those Ancient Hymns, whatever they might contain of sublime poetry, or of mythology very different from modern Hindooism, were, in no sense, monotheistic—that they contained no theory either of morals adapted to this life, or of theology relating to another, which could in any way satisfy the wants of modern Hindoos who had once got adrift from the anchorage of blind obedience to their family priests.

Ramahoun Roy himself seems to have found rest for his soul in a belief which differed little from that of a philosophical Unitarian of this century; but few of his followers got so far, and of the few who did, the major part went further, and became, openly or in secret, believers in Christianity as taught by one or other of the Missions established in Bengal.

But the major part elaborated for themselves another form of Hindooism—called by them Brahmoism, after their name for the Great Spirit—which comes nearer to the Christian's conception of the One Eternal God than any other Being recognised by the generality of Hindoos.

It is difficult to give any definite description of a creed which seems to change from year to year, and of which it has been truly said,* that at one time its votaries assert that Sacred Writings alone contain Truth, at another that the Works of Nature alone give Light; that at one time their God is all Love, at another all Justice; that the system now is Atheistic, now Pantheistic; that the doctrine of an Intercessor is at one time rejected with contempt, at another not only adopted but carried further than in any other known religion,—inasmuch as the Leader of the Intellectual and Eclectic Deism of India is addressed as the Mediator between God and man, having himself very recently propounded the doctrine,—that every remarkable man is as much a Divine Incarnation as was Christ.

But the fairest mode of judging of their tenets is to let them speak for themselves.

The following may be taken as a recent and authoritative account of the present phase of the belief of an influential member of the Brahma Samaj.† It is abridged from an anniversary lecture‡ delivered early in this year at Calcutta. The lecturer starts by describing the love of freedom as the chief characteristic of the present age—freedom in all departments of speculation and practice—in politics—in education—in society—in religion. Sceptics as to old doctrines and dogmas, men anxiously look forward to the Church of the future. Theology must harmonize, if possible, conflicting views, and determine "where all religious movements are likely to meet and unite in future" (p. 2). For many reasons, the sincere believer must be assured that the Church to which he belongs has not only a glorious past but also a glorious future—"the true Church must be the future Church," hence every sincere believer is bound,

---

* *Vide* 'Proceedings of the Church Missionary Society' for 1868–69.

† The Baboo Kesub Chunder Sen. See note, p. 380.

‡ 'The Future Church. A Lecture delivered on the thirty-ninth anniversary of the Bráhma Samaj, in the Town Hall, Calcutta, on Saturday, 23rd Jan. 1869. Calcutta: printed at the Indian Mirror Press, 53, College Street. 1869.'

"for the sake of truth and salvation," to decide what is to be "the future Church of the world" (p. 3).

In answering this question, the lecturer promises to follow, as far as possible, the lessons of history—not the visions of fancy.

History, he says, tells us "there are two poles of the axis of thought on which the mind revolves." Two opposite ideas always struggling against each other; and when the mind is repelled from one, it is generally impelled towards the other. Thus we see a perpetual struggle between Materialism and Worldliness on the one side, against Idealism and Mysticism on the other—between authority and freedom in matters of thought.

Moreover, he tells us, History shows that no religious system is wholly false. Hence we may not entirely condemn any creed, nor hate its followers.

Again, History assures us that, endless as are the religious differences between various sects and epochs, the parallelisms are equally remarkable. It is the same human nature everywhere working. This enables us to understand "why certain evils—idolatry and superstition, for instance—have been reproduced in different forms in the world's history, from time to time, in spite of attempts to prevent them," and we should be prepared to see them reappear (p. 7).

There are three elementary and fundamental ideas which enter into all theological as well as philosophical thought and speculation; namely, "mind, matter, and God."

These give rise to different creeds and philosophical schools, according as exclusive importance is attached to one or the other: but we cannot eliminate any of these ideas from theology; all we need do is to harmonize them. "Too much devotion to material objects, and an abnormal feeling of astonishment at their sublimity and power," lead to idolatry and polytheism. "Too much concentration of the mind on self and its exclusion from the external world," lead to idealism and pantheism; hero worship to "prophetism;" all these arise "from mistaken identification of one or other of the two created realities—mind and matter—with the Creator." Such errors are to be prevented or remedied by adjusting the mutual relations of these "three primary facts" (p. 9).

"True theology must not only admit the reality of the material world, but recognise its important functions and uses in

the economy of man's redemption, while it must condemn, in the most unqualified manner, anything approaching to the worship of matter."

The material universe is a great religious teacher. When men superstitiously regard it, not as God's creation, but as the Creator itself, they are drawn away into idolatry or nature worship. We may "recognise matter as God's holy work, and let it help us to know and love Him; but we must not kneel down and worship it as God" (p. 11).

So also "the importance of mind as another revelation of God must be recognised, and its legitimate uses in the matter of our salvation rightly determined." The soul of man is something made in the image of its Maker; and "in a condition of piety," in prayer and in communion with Him, "we feel His direct inspiration." The abuse of this feeling—the result of too much devotion to the spirit—is soul-worship—pantheism.

Besides the general respect due to every mind, peculiar respect is due to superior minds. Hence greater honour is justly paid to God's more devoted servants, "good men—reformers and prophets," than to dead matter or ordinary humanity. The abuse of this feeling is man-worship—deification of the prophet—who, instead of being honoured as a teacher, has been worshipped as God in human form (p. 14).

"The future Church will steer clear of all these shoals." Matter, Mind, and Greatness of character will be recognised—nature-worship, self-worship, and hero-worship must be avoided. But how will these three fundamental "facts of consciousness" be respected, and yet the Unity of God maintained? This is the great question to be solved by the future Church. "In its solution we shall find an effective safeguard against the three forms of false worship and the positive establishment of unitarian worship. In other words, the realisation of the grand doctrine of Unity in Trinity." "Unity of the Divinity"—"trinity of Divine manifestations."

"Thus is all false worship—that of nature, self, and greatness—rendered impossible."

"In this harmony will all the struggles and wranglings between contending systems of worship ultimately end." "Thus shall all Churches blend together in the Church of the One True God, and all the false Deities they now worship shall be reduced

to a beautiful created Trinity, subordinate to the Highest Divine unity of the Creator." Idolatry, Pantheism, and Man-worship will be denounced, not only as errors, but as high-treason against the Most High. As regards these three evils, the future Church will be "unsparingly destructive,"—"will pull down with iconoclastic fury all temples where any such false worship prevails;" but from the ruins will reserve and preserve all that is good. The future Church will be "representative,"—"will satisfy all real wants and necessities of nature;" the delusions, errors, and sins of the idolater, the pantheist, the prophet-worshipper "will certainly be destroyed," but the genuine aspirations of their nature will be duly satisfied. "Instead of a hundred hostile Churches, there shall be upreared, in fulness of time, one vast Cathedral, where all mankind shall worship with one heart the Supreme Creator" (p. 18).

Thus multiplicity of prevalent systems of worships are "harmonized in the future Church." Next comes the harmony of doctrines. The answer of "that immortal son of God, Jesus," "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart and with all thy mind, and with all thy soul, and with all thy strength, and thy neighbour as thyself," is "the essence of true religion," "simply and exhaustively expounded." The fulness and completeness of these "fundamental principles of ethics and religion" is expounded at some length, and with greater clearness than the rest of the Lecture.

The Gospel of the future Church is, we are told, to be the Gospel of God's infinite mercy, and on this doctrine the lecturer is both full, clear, and eloquent. "The only true gospel of salvation" is "the Parable of the Prodigal Son." "The future Church will not seek salvation in books or men, in ceremonies or articles of faith; but it will call on individuals and nations to put their faith in the only true Gospel of salvation—God's infinite and all-conquering mercy" (p. 27).

Such is the "worship, creed, and gospel" of the "universal Church of the future." In conclusion, the lecturer observes with special reference to India, that to denounce either Mohammedanism or Hindooism as wholly false, indicates "the spirit of sectarian antipathy." There must be some truth and purity in both systems worthy of honour. They cannot be destroyed, they must be purified and developed till both, hitherto so hostile

to each other, ultimately "harmonize to form the future Church of India" (p. 28).

The Hindoo god, we are informed, is the Infinite Spirit dwelling in His own glory, pervading all space, full of peace and joy. The Mohammedan god is infinite in power, governing the universe with supreme authority as Lord of All. Hence the Hindoo's religion is quiet contemplation, that of the Mohammedan active service—blended together, these two elements will form a "beautiful picture of true theology," which will be realised by harmonious coalition in the future Church of India. Its creed will be "a composite faith," "combining the profound devotion of the one and the heroic enthusiasm of the other" (p. 29).

"As regards Christianity," we will quote at length the lecturer's own words:—

"As regards Christianity, and its relation to the future Church of India, I have no doubt in my mind that it will exercise great influence on the growth and formation of that Church.

"The spirit of Christianity has already pervaded the whole atmosphere of Indian society, and we breathe, think, feel, and move in a Christian atmosphere.

"Native society is being roused, enlightened, and reformed under the influence of Christian education. If it is true that the future of a nation is determined by all the circumstances and agencies, which to-day influence its nascent growth, surely the future Church of this country will be the result of the purer elements of the leading creeds of the day—harmonized, developed, and shaped under the influence of Christianity.

"But the future Church of India must be thoroughly national; it must be an essentially Indian Church. The future religion of the world I have described will be the common religion of all nations; but in each nation it will have an indigenous growth, and assume a distinctive and peculiar character.

"All mankind will unite in a universal Church; at the same time, it will be adapted to the peculiar circumstances of each nation, and assume a national form.

"No country will borrow or mechanically imitate the religion of another country; but from the depths of the life of each nation its future Church will naturally grow up. And shall not India have its own National Church?

"Dr. Norman Macleod, in expounding, last year, in this very hall, his ideas of the future Church of this country, said emphatically

that it would be a purely Indian Church, and not a reproduction of any of the Established Churches of the West.

"Though I differ from that learned and liberal-minded gentleman in regard to the doctrines and tenets of that Church, as set forth by him, I fully agree with him that that Church must have a strictly national growth and a national organization.

"Neither will Germany adopt the religious life of China.

"Nor will India accept blindly that of England, or of any other European country.

"India has religious traditions and associations, tastes and customs peculiarly sacred and dear to her, just as every other country has; and it is idle to expect that she will forego these. Nay, she cannot do so, as they are interwoven with her very life.

"In common with all other nations and communities, we shall embrace the Theistic worship, creed, and gospel of the future Church. We shall acknowledge and adore the Holy One, accept the love and service of God and man as our creed, and put our firm faith in God's almighty grace, as the only means of our redemption.

"But we shall do all this in a strictly national and Indian style.

"We shall see that the future Church is not thrust upon us, but that we independently and naturally grow into it—that it does not come to us as a foreign plant, but that it strikes its roots deep in the national heart of India, draws its sap from our national resources, and develops itself with all the freshness and vigour of indigenous growth.

"One religion shall be acknowledged by all men: one God shall be worshipped throughout the length and breadth of the world: the same spirit of faith and love shall pervade all hearts: all nations shall dwell together in the Father's house, yet each shall have its own peculiar and free mode of action.

"There shall, in short, be unity of spirit, but diversity of forms: one body, but different limbs: one vast community, with members labouring in different ways, and according to their respective resources and peculiar tastes to advance their common cause.

"Thus India shall sing the glory of the Supreme Lord, with Indian voice and with Indian accompaniments, and so shall England and America, and the various races and tribes and nations of the world, with their own peculiar voice and music, sing His glory; but all their different voices and peculiar modes of chanting, shall commingle in one sweet swelling chorus: one universal anthem, proclaiming in solemn and stirring notes, in the world below and the heavens above, the Fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man.

"May the merciful Lord hasten the advent of the true Church, and establish peace and harmony among His children. And as His name has been solemnly chanted to-night in this splendid hall, by an immense concourse of worshippers of various races and tribes, so may all His children assemble in His Holy mansions, and, blending their million voices in one grand chorus, glorify Him—time without end."

Any abridgment, of course, does very imperfect justice to an address of this kind, but not in the way of exaggerating the want of precision in the use of terms, or the general vagueness and illogical character of all the affirmative theological statements, unless where they are borrowed almost bodily from the Bible. The student of modern English, German, or American metaphysics will recognise many an old acquaintance in the negative portions; but the most striking peculiarity is the almost entire absence of any genuine Hindoo element in the theology. There is not a sentence which might not have been written by a deistical reader of moral philosophy in an European University, who had never heard the name of any Hindoo Deity.

This clearly is not the sort of material which can either cement together the disintegrated particles of Hindoo society, or which, if it did, could long withstand the shock of hostile criticism. It lays no claim to any authority or standard stronger or more accurate than the believer's conscience, and is therefore liable to infinite variations, not only at different times and in different people, but in the same individual at different periods of his life. It might satisfy an enthusiastic dreamer as long as he could live in a cloud-land of his own invention; but to men struggling in practical life it offers no guide or support, and there is scarcely a page of the New Testament which would not be more acceptable than the whole body of Brahmoist divinity, to one oppressed by the difficulties of this world, or by doubts regarding the next.

Yet such as it is, it forms the sole alternative, short of bold unbelief, which has hitherto been presented to the Hindoo, who, revolting from his ancestral faith as interpreted by the family priest, yet hesitates to accept Christianity.

The inherent weakness of the position taken up by the Brahmoists is rendered more conspicuous by the ability displayed in some of the controversial writings on the other side,

which have been published by natives, converts to Christianity. One of these,* by a converted Maharatta Brahman, professes to come from an unlearned pen. But the argumentative power, as well as the thoroughly Christian spirit, with which it is written would do no discredit to any Doctor of Divinity in any University in Europe.

Brahmoism cannot as yet be said to have extended much beyond the educated natives of Bengal; but its importance consists in the fact that it very fairly represents the general effect which Christianity and the Western intellectual culture, which takes its character from Christianity, produce when brought in contact with Brahmanism in its purely religious aspect. Political considerations, such as largely mingle with the Brahmanism of Maharattas, Sikhs, and other races who have lately exercised sovereign power and also commercial pursuits, modify the effects in various ways, and so do rural occupations and constant intercourse with races more or less non-Aryan or anti-Brahmanical.

Before referring to races who are not Hindoos by descent, and whose religion is probably older than the popular Brahmanism, and, in some respects, antagonistic to it, we must briefly describe the effect of Christian Missions on the Mohammedans—a creed which embraces men of every race in India, and of every variety of national character, from the Belooch Highlander, brawny of limb and slow of intellect, the type of stubborn untutored barbarous fidelity and courage, or the magnificent Affghan, showy, brilliant, and fickle, down to the lithe and diminutive hero of many a sensational tale, whose so-called "feline characteristics" of person and disposition are generally caricatured from the natives of the damper regions of Southern or Eastern India.

Sometimes the Mohammedans form almost the entire population throughout large provinces; sometimes they are scattered in single families in the midst of men of other creeds; but a few are found almost throughout India, and their religious peculiarities are everywhere conspicuous, and render them easily distinguishable from the rest of the population. Many are direct

---

* 'A Letter to the Brahmos, from a converted Brahman of Benares. 2nd edit. Allahabad. 1868.' It is written by Nehemiah (Nila Kantha) Goreh, and is dated Calcutta, Aug. 1867.

descendants of the countrymen, some even of the family, of the prophet of Arabia. Many more are converts from among the Hindoos, of every age, from the earliest Moslem invasion to the present day.

It has been debated whether the Crusades or Bluebeard, and other fictions in which Mohammedan heroes figure, have had most share in forming the modern popular ideal of Mohammedanism. Certainly no melodramatist's hero ever departed more widely from the truth of nature, or gave less of a clue to the real motives of human action, than does the ordinary Englishman's notion of the creeds and moral codes of Mohammedans.

If the writings of some modern authors, and especially of Dr. Deutsch, give us a portrait which is somewhat too favourable, they at all events place within popular reach the keys of a right understanding of all that is special and peculiar in Mohammedan belief and ethics, by tracing the derivation of the Talmud from the Mosaic law, and the intimate connection of Mohammedanism with Talmudical Judaism and Christianity.

Dr. Deutsch's essays, or Mr. Palgrave's, or Burkhardt's descriptions of the religion they found in Arabia, will show by comparison with any sketch of Hindooism, how little there is in common between the two systems. The bond between Hindoo and Mohammedan, in fact, is almost always one simply of race or nationality; and, when this is allowed for, it will be found that the true affinity of creed in the Mohammedan is rather with Christianity than with Hindooism.

Unfortunately, such intellectual affinities of creed do not, even among Christians, always conduce to community of feelings; and, in the case of Mohammedans, the fact that theirs had been an imperial creed in India, and Christianity had supplanted it, would for ages prevent any toleration save that with which the decrees of fate and inevitable necessity are regarded.

But within the last few years a very curious change has been coming over the feeling of at least the educated portion of the Mohammedans, with regard to Christianity. Converse, and still more controversy, with Christians, have led the Mohammedans to a more careful and critical examination of many Scriptures which they, as well as we, regard as the sacred utterances of inspired men, but which, till of late, had been generally neglected for the study of later and exclusively Mohammedan

authors. The same prophecies which we read are read by the Mohammedan, and frequently the same canons of interpretation are applied to them—notably with regard to those portions which relate to the chronology of the events foretold, so that Christian and Mohammedan are found agreeing as to the dates to which particular prophecies apply, even when they differ as to the persons or dynasties referred to. This is particularly the case with regard to the numbers specified in the concluding chapters of the book of Daniel. I have known instances where the result deduced by the interpreter had been popularised, and passed into a tradition current among people who had no notion whence it was derived. Many of these interpretations point to great changes which are to take place in this century and about our own age. The first impulse of the Mohammedan interpreter is naturally to find, in prophecies of history and power, promises to his own people, and, in the denunciations of evil, a foreshadowing of vengeance which is to overtake his enemies. But sometimes events and facts are too strong to be bent to support such interpretations, and the general result of this study of prophecy is to exercise a depressing effect on the Mohammedan student regarding the future of his creed. This impression passes beyond the theological student into popular belief, and extends to many other races and creeds. Thus, during the mutiny years, the conviction that the terms of days foretold by Daniel pointed to some great catastrophe to Islam, depressed and unnerved many a thoughtful Mohammedan, and a vague popular tradition, grounded on the same prophecy, helped to confirm even Hindoos in their belief that the Christian power must ultimately triumph.

From this and other causes, the Mohammedan controversialist of to-day is less confident and less sanguine of victory than of old. There is less expectation of triumph for Islam under the existing order of things — there is more disposition to look for the visible inauguration of a new era. The advent of the Imaum Mehdi who is to come to judgment preparatory to a renewal of all things, and the punishment of the unconverted, are eagerly anticipated by Mohammedan enthusiasts; and our Lord is often associated with the Imaum, or with a reappearance of Mohammed, in the vision of the future, to which other details are added apparently borrowed from our own popular interpretations

of Prophecy. Of all this, as far as I have been able to ascertain, little trace was to be found in the popular expectations of the Mohammedans of a single generation ago.

We are not likely to see in Mohammedanism any eclectic phase such as we are now witnessing in Hindooism; modifications of this character appear incompatible with the simple and definite principles of the creed. But a revolution of some kind seems impending, the popular feeling regarding it among Mohammedans themselves is not one of hopefulness, and the Christian Missionary is now listened to by the young Mohammedan student with an inclination to examine what he says of which the Missionary of thirty years back saw few examples.*

We must now refer to those vast communities, aggregating, according to some statisticians, 40 millions of souls, whose creeds, varying from Sabeanism to the grossest kind of Fetishism, have little in common with anything belonging to the Hindoo Pantheon, equally little with Mohammedanism.

Many considerable nations of such people live apart, and form the entire population of large provinces; sometimes, but not always, consisting of mountainous, unhealthy, or inaccessible country. Many more are scattered throughout the Hindoo communities in a kind of Helotage. They appear to be the remnants of aboriginal races, or of immigrants anterior to what we recognise as the Aryan races, and of quite a different stock. Some of these, who claim to be Autocthones or their immediate conquerors of a pre-Aryan period, seem to have been subsequently driven into the fastnesses of forest and mountain, while others were reduced to bondage and serfdom by later Aryan invaders.

It is only of late years that the progress of ethnological and historical research has clearly proved these races to have a different origin and history from those of the Hindoo nations which surround them, or among whom they are interspersed. Wherever they are found, whether as separate tribes or as helots and serfs, among the purer Hindoo races, they are generally more accessible

---

* Very curious illustrations of the present feeling of the Mohammedans of Northern India towards Christianity will be found in the Autobiography of the Rev. Imaduddeen, a converted Mohammedan, translated by the Rev. R. Clark, and lately published by the Church Missionary Society, Salisbury Square, Fleet Street, 1869.

to the truths preached by the Christian Missionary, than the Hindoos. They are free from many prejudices, and from some characteristic vices of their more advanced and fortunate neighbours, though they have other failings peculiarly their own. Like all races which have long been kept in a position of distinct inferiority, they gladly listen to any teaching which does not inculcate the unchangeable perfection of things as they are. Locally they are known to the Hindoos, especially where the races live to some extent intermingled, by a variety of names, implying not, as we are apt to call them, that they are "*outcastes*," for most of them have never belonged to any regular Hindoo caste; but that they are "outsiders" or "extra-muralists." In all well-organized Hindoo towns and villages in the plain country they are made to dwell apart, generally outside the town or village walls, if there are any. They have their own houses, wells, &c., which they can use without defiling their fellow-townsmen, and have each their own share of the work of the community assigned to them.

It is difficult to convey to one who has never witnessed it an idea of the practical working of this state of things, especially on the social, moral, and religious relations of the people.

Perhaps the nearest approach to it would be by imagining that in a large English rural township the descendants of the various successive races—the earlier and later Celts, the Picts and Romans, the Saxons, Danes, Normans, and later immigrants from Germany or France—all lived together in peace, but perfectly distinct; and never intermarrying, save Celt with Celt, Saxon with Saxon, Norman with Norman.

Let us suppose that these races had divided among themselves in ages long gone by, not only the lands of the village, but all occupations, crafts, and trades; that every one kept rigorously to the work or profession of his father, and that each family guild or community governed itself by an unwritten code of customary law, to which all paid implicit obedience, under pain of excommunication, social, professional, and religious, so rigorous as far to exceed in severity any ecclesiastical censure of the middle ages.

Everywhere prominent among these Indian communities we find Brahmans, of various families and clans, but all of common ancestry. They were an ancient race, claiming descent from

the gods, when Alexander the Great invaded India, and then and ever since have asserted their right to the sole possession of the keys of knowledge; and though not uniformly successful, they have managed, while nominally abjuring all interest in worldly affairs, to absorb every kind of worldly power. No Norman clergy, in the palmiest days of ecclesiastical supremacy, exercised half the authority which has for ages been conceded to the Brahmans throughout India.

Such a village community as I have described possesses a vitality unknown in any other form of society with which I am acquainted; and to its peculiarities may be ascribed the extraordinary manner in which civilisation and order survive in India all shocks of political revolution, war, pestilence, and famine.

In the ties which bind the community together are included not only the laws, written and unwritten, of caste, and religious observance as by usage established, but of municipal and guild government. How they grew up no one knows. Charters and old records tell us little of their history. We only know that they have existed for ages; that no one in the village can tell of times when they did not exist, and that till we came into the country the ancient usage, which they could plead, was found a sufficient sanction for their observance.

It is of little importance to the village at large, as compared with any European community, who rules at the distant capital. Individual members, and sometimes large branches of the whole body of inhabitants, may have an ethnological or even a personal interest in the question whether Hindoo or Mohammedan, Sikh or Englishman, reigns supreme. But it is long before the village, as a body, learns to care whether King or Emperor, Grand Duke or Robber Knight, establishes his claim to reign without a superior or sovereign lord over him. Whoever comes must have revenue for his exchequer, and revenue will come in large quantities only by tilling the land, and the land will not be tilled unless people are let alone, and live in order and quiet. This simple sequence is more or less present to the mind of every prudent native administrator; nad his general object will be "to let the people alone," to group themselves under their old local officials and fellow-workers, according to their traditionary usages, to cultivate and to thrive; assured that the working bees will make honey fast enough, in due time; and

that at the proper season, and with ordinary care, the careful beemaster, who knows what he is about, may take his full share of the accumulation, year after year, without starving or driving away the swarm.

I speak of the prudent administrator; of course avarice and incompetence, or favouritism, may delay or spoil the result; may bring in Court favourites, or revenue farmers, or rack-renters, in one form or another, and starve the hive. But, as a rule, it requires a more thorough political revolution, a more powerful central government, and stronger and more persistent elements of change than any the country had seen until we came to it, to make much permanent alteration in, or do much permanent damage to, the village agricultural and industrial corporations.

Almost any old Indian, who has lived much in remote rural districts not yet recovered from a visitation of war or famine, will recal many instances of the wonderful vitality of village organization which he has there witnessed.

The village may have been for generations a desolate heap of ruins; the village lands untilled, and relapsed into forest; not an inhabitant to be found within miles. But when peace and quiet are restored, and it is told round the country-side that a good ruler has appeared in the land, and that the old landholders are invited back, straightway they come from all quarters. Each cultivator finds out and ploughs the waste fields his father, or, it may be, his grandsire, tilled; each artisan returns to his old work, as if he had never left it, and receives payment in kind at the old rates, and at the old seasons, with the old forms; and, above all, the Brahmans of the old families bear rule none the less absolute because they profess immunity from all care for mundane interests.

For many years after the introduction of direct British rule, the cultivators in such a village have a halcyon time of it. The soil, after its long rest, is unusually fertile; assessments are light; they have to do with but one master, and he is usually not only all-powerful, but active, intelligent, and benevolent; a selected English officer, who understands their ways and their *patois*, and who, if he were only less overwhelmed with work, and less frequently changed, would be no bad representative of a mundane providence.

But, as the newly conquered province becomes gradually assimilated to the rest of the empire, the work of administration gets divided among diverse centralised departments, and a process commences which, in a generation or two, and sometimes in a much shorter time, gradually but surely dissolves the ties which have for ages held together the rural community under every trial of war, tyranny, or providential visitation.

The process is by no means a simple one, and it is much easier to find fault with it than to suggest remedies; but it is so important, as affecting the whole structure of rural society in India, and, indirectly, is so much connected with the religious questions before us, that it deserves the closest scrutiny by all who are interested in Missions.

The first change the villagers note is a diminution of power in their rulers. As years roll on, they see that the officers in immediate communication with them have less authority than at first, and are less prompt and decided in using what they have. The reasons are plain enough to us, but they are a puzzle to the villagers, who seldom get beyond the obvious "Ah! the 'Sahibs' of this generation are not such rulers of man as in our young days."

Then power and responsibility become every day more separated. At first one "Sahib" concentrated all authority in himself. If any one else came to lay out roads, to build bridges, or to measure fields, he was clearly subordinate to the "great Sahib," the one representative of Government.

But after a while the work is divided. First the larger judicial powers are separated from the executive and administrative. This is not quite unintelligible to the villagers, for they have traditions of judges of their own, who cared for neither king nor Cæsar—and they think it rather meritorious in a despot to insist on his judges being independent. But as the subdivision goes on, and every fresh addition to the army of Government functionaries owns allegiance to some separate centralised department, the villagers get puzzled. If, as sometimes happens, they find one official lamenting, and, as far as he can, counteracting, what another department has done, the puzzle increases. It culminates when there arises some grievance, admitted and felt by all, which no Government official can deny or excuse, but which all declare to be irremediable,

though the villager fancies a stroke of the pen ought to set it to rights. Englishmen understand what is meant by "departmental difficulties" and a "conflict of departments," but to the Indian villager's mind it is a perpetual puzzle.

Gradually this division of authority tells on the village constitution. There are discontented members in the happiest of families, and an Indian village is not free from such troublesome elements. Malcontents soon discover that administration by departments affords the "Village Hampden" endless opportunities of worrying the "little tyrant of his fields," with much greater comfort and safety to himself than by the old process of giving up his lands and driving off his cattle to cultivate for a few seasons under some rival potentate, till the village elders make up the feud, and bring him back to his ancestral acres.

So if he quarrels with the Headman of his village, and finds that the English Prefect or Lord-Lieutenant of his county supports the village authorities, and that the law courts promise no redress, the malcontent looks out for a departmental patron. One or other of the departments of Post-office, Railways, Telegraphs, and Public Works, is likely to extend its ramifications within reach of most villages, and remote and poor indeed must be the hamlet which is never visited by some functionary of the Survey, or Vaccination, Education, or Forest Departments.

What the "Department" may be, matters little, provided its local representative can be got to interfere in some way which sets the authority of the village Headman and his council of elders at naught; and the revenge is all the sweeter if, as often happens, the village authorities are checkmated by some "department" of whose name they have scarcely heard, and of whose functions they have the vaguest possible notion.

But in general the Civil Courts of Justice, with their novel codes and irresistible law process, or the Land Survey and Settlement Departments—invaluable in themselves,—are the most universal and most potent of the agencies to crush and disintegrate the fossilised institutions that have lasted for so many ages.

This is no exaggeration of a process which is going on in most parts of India; is breaking up, much more rapidly and completely than we fancy, the old bonds which have for centuries kept rural society together, under circumstances of

adversity such as in any other country would have gone far to destroy all traces of civilisation.

The process may be a natural, perhaps an inevitable sequence of our system of administration; but it is not the less a puzzle to the villagers, and they cannot always see the remoter benefits which it brings in its train.

Still more potent, if less universally diffused, is the disintegrating agency of our religion, which I mention last because, though most effective of all, it is the agency with which the British Government has least active concern.

The period soon passes by when the villagers of a newly annexed district believed, as they too often used to do at first, that the "Sahibs" are atheists, without religion; and when the village matrons hushed their children with threats of making them over to the "Sahib" to be buried alive in the foundations of the court-house or the bridge he was constructing.

Probably, with very few exceptions, the evening conclave of village Elders in most hamlets has long since settled, after frequent discussions, not only that the English gentlemen have a religion, but that they think a good deal about it.

All who have visited the Head-Quarter Garrison station of the Province, know that some kind of a place of worship is considered as necessary as a mess-house, a canteen, or a theatre, to a complete set of barracks. They see the European soldiers marched off, with bands playing, every Sunday to one and sometimes to two or three of these churches, whither the gentlemen and ladies drive in their carriages to listen to "Padres" of various kinds. All public work is stopped, and a general holiday is kept. Then there is often a "Devil's House," as the Freemason's Lodge is generally termed, where meetings are held at night, with mysterious ceremonies, which, more than any religious services held among Europeans, seem to awaken the curiosity of the native country-cousin who comes to town to see the world.

All this the village Elders know from their own observation or from the eye-witness of respectable people, and "have no need to listen to the marvellous tales which are told by some of the low-caste fellows who may have served in the garrison as hewers of wood and drawers of water, as horse-keepers, and in other menial offices under the English."

"Religion of some kind is evidently an important business with these white-skinned people." But its exact nature is usually for a long time a puzzle to the villagers.

They do not often learn much in explanation of this mystery from the first Englishmen who visit their village. These busy officials have seldom time for talk except on official subjects. Nevertheless, the villagers observe that many of them cease from official work on Sunday. A few may make it a day of amusement, but there is generally something clearly religious about the observance. If a villager makes bold to ask a question or two on the subject from the great man—he sometimes hears a good deal more. But usually the great man is reserved, and advises the querist "to inquire from the first Padre he meets."

Perhaps a "Padre" may visit the village while the great man is there, and then the observant villagers remark that the freest livers among the "Sahibs" pay him marked respect—even though he may be a "Dhurm Padre"—a priest that is, for the love of God, *i.e.* a Missionary, and not a Government official.

Such a Padre is pretty sure to extend his walk towards the village, to converse with the Elders at their evening conclave, and say a few words to the women who come to draw at the village well. He gives tracts and books to all who will accept them and promise to read them, and often goes his way with a heavy heart, and a note in his journal, expressive of his still deferred hopes that some good may follow his efforts in his Lord's service though so little result is apparent.

But though not apparent to him, his visit is often a most important era in the history of the village, when he least thinks he has made any impression. Like every other visitor of note, he is talked over at the evening meeting of the village Elders, and the talk is generally some index to the popular opinion.

A fanatic or two, the bigoted old Brahman Shastri, and a rather disaffected Mohammedan Moolla, are of opinion that "under a well ordered government such preaching would be stopped. If it were not for fear of British Courts and British bayonets it *would* soon be stopped. It is all part and parcel of the same insidious design for taking all rent-free lands from temples and mosques, and turning the people into Christians."

They would probably say a good deal more in the same strain, if the prudent Elders did not interfere to stop anything which malicious eavesdroppers might construe into treason against Government.

Generally the seniors and well-to-do people in the assembly, are very decidedly of opinion that, "every man should stick to the religion in which he was born. Every nation has a religion of its own, and all are true, each for its own nation. Just as there are different sorts of eyes for birds, beasts, fishes, and reptiles, yet all see at the same time by the same light." "This," they generally believe, "must be the opinion of the Government itself. Else why does Government disclaim all official connection with the Missionary? Why does it not order him to teach every one in the name of the State? At any rate, this sort of preaching is never likely to come to anything. Their ancient gods have lasted too long to be set aside by any new-fangled foreign worship."

Probably, as regards both the views of Government and the futility of the Padre's preaching, the feelings of the speakers are less positive than their expressions, and the more sagacious have a sort of instinctive misgiving that though the Padre is not a "Department," his talk is likely to work more change in the village than all the Departments in India put together. But they have no very obvious grounds for their fears, and therefore say little about them.

There are, however, two or three who do not cease to think of the subject when the assembly breaks up.

In every village community will be found some men of naturally devout minds, ill-content with what their ancestral system offers them. Their hearts have been stirred by misfortune or suffering—their consciences awakened they hardly know how. They have vainly sought rest for their souls by self-inflicted penances, and long pilgrimages, and sacrifices of what they love or value. In this state they hear something from this new religion, some words of St. Paul or St. John, or some saying of our Lord's, which seems to promise them what they have long sought, and they resolve, if possible, to learn more about it.

Then there are members of the "outside" population—the helots and serfs, who, important as they are to the village com-

munity, are not admitted to the Council of Elders, but talk among themselves, in a little Council of their own, under the tree by their huts outside the village. There has been much to stir their minds ever since these white faces first appeared in the land. The yeomen of pure Hindoo descent, the shopkeepers and the Brahmans, still hold these outsiders, as they have done for ages past, unclean, and feel polluted by their touch; but the "Sahibs" do not appear to think so, at least not till they learn it from the Brahmans. The younger Sahibs may be sometimes hot and hasty, and get impatient when people don't understand their bad pronunciation, but it is clear they don't agree with the Brahmans in matters of caste; and every one of the speakers has some instance of his own experience, something which occurred when he was hunting or shooting with the Sahib, or when he was giving evidence in his Court, or taking a message from him, which proves that the Sahib looks upon all these distinctions of caste as nonsense, and that he would not even object to drink water of the helot's drawing, provided it was brought in a clean vessel.

Then whenever they stir out of their own village some evidence meets them of the equalising, levelling tendencies of the British Government—of its entire disregard for the distinctions of caste which so largely modify the action of every native administration. "At the great public works every one gets paid according to his work—no one asks what is the workman's caste, or where he comes from. Then what incarnations of justice, equity, and equality, are the roads and railroads! How straight they go! caring no more for the Headman's or Rajah's field than for the Helot's rubbish heap; everybody goes together by train, the prince and the peasant—all get accommodated according to what they pay, without distinction of caste or rank, and all arrive at the same time! It is the same with their courts of justice; if you have only money enough you may sue anybody you please, and get a decree too, sometimes, and have it executed against the wealthiest banker in the county town (though that is a dangerous experiment, by no means to be recommended, for, after all, Lukshmi, the goddess of wealth, has it all her way in this world, and bankers are her special favourites). Then, this 'Lightning-post,' what a wonderful invention it is! It beats even the railway as a manifestation of

benevolence, justice, and equality; for every one's message goes in turn, and all for the same price per dozen words."*

Now, this equalising and levelling policy, which at first was a great puzzle to the villagers, seems explained by what this Dhurm Padre says. "He tells of One God over all—of One Saviour for all—and insists that this God made of one blood all mankind—that there is no distinction before Him of Brahman or 'outsider;' that all will be equal in death, and all be judged by one rule after death."

"If the Sahibs really believe this, no wonder all their doings and inventions have such a levelling tendency." The oldest of the community of outsiders have never heard anything of the kind before, and some of them resolve "to inquire more about what the Padre says, and, if possible, make their children attend some school where they may learn to read these books, which the Padre gives so freely, and which tell such wonderful things, not only of London, and railways, and the electric telegraph, but of New Heavens and a New Earth, in which dwelleth righteousness."

Perhaps the profoundest impression, though he says least about it, is made on the young Brahman, the village schoolmaster, it may be, or vaccinator, or postmaster. He has listened almost in silence to the discussion among the village Elders. He was born in the village, and had been taught a little Sanskrit by his father in boyhood; he has received a good education in his own language, and learnt enough of English to wish to learn more, at a Government school in the provincial capital. The course of study was carefully secular; and when, as was constantly the case, the scholar's inquiries wandered into fields of discussion more or less connected with religion, the subject was avoided in a manner rather calculated to pique the inquirer's curiosity. But there was so much to be learnt about the world and its history and affairs that the scholar deferred further inquiry, and at length returned to his village as a Government *employé* in some department, on a salary superior to all the hereditary allowances of the village magnates put together, and paid punctually in cash monthly. He is a rich, and would be

---

* These are not imaginary conversations, but taken from remarks which any one who talks to this class of people may hear almost any day in their common conversation.

an influential man, but he has got quite out of joint with his old playfellows and their parents; he has in his heart the most profound contempt for all that his father, the bigoted old Shastri, and his friends, go on talking about their gods, and the silly and licentious tales of what their gods did, which seem to him fit only to amuse vicious children; he is pained at their open worship of their hideous stone and metal idols, whose legendary acts and attributes appear to his awakened moral sense even more debased than their outward forms.

But this he is forced to keep to himself. He would not willingly vex his father or his kind old mother, and woe be to him if they or their friends suspected half the thoughts that rise in his heart! So he works at his official duties; has a talk now and then with a former class-fellow, who visits the village as a surveyor, tax-assessor, or in some other public "Department," and who, he finds, is as unsettled as himself; and muses often on the inexplicable tangle of human affairs.

He has never been in the way of knowing much directly about the religion of these Sahibs, and is rather glad when he hears that the "Dhurm Padre" has come to the village. He goes to listen, and, may be, is at first inclined to treat with contempt some apparent want of school learning. "The 'Padre' is evidently not as profound a Shastri as his own father, nor as great at the differential calculus as the Cambridge professor from whom he heard lectures at the Government College;" but as he listens, one social or moral problem after another, which he had been used to ponder over, and found so difficult to solve, receives new light, and a history of the world, its past and its future, is revealed to him—so simple, so consistent, and so fully explaining many of his doubts and difficulties, that, if he could but believe it, he feels that a great weight would be removed from his mind, and he would be a happier man.

But it is not only with regard to his own personal relations to God and his fellow men that the young Brahman feels a new light has broken in on him. He is a patriot, after his way, though his way is different from patriots French or English, Germans or Fenians, in Europe. He has dreams of his own about his own people and country which he hardly dares breathe to himself, as he mourns over the hopeless internal divisions of India, and feels that heavy as may be the yoke of

the most benevolent foreign ruler, it must be borne as long as the children of India are so obviously unable to combine for the common good, and rule themselves.

In the simple truths which the "Dhurm Padre" urges so earnestly,—with no object but the personal salvation of his hearers, the young Brahman thinks he sees the secret of that wonderful power which has enabled the people of a remote islet in the Northern Seas to subjugate the hundred millions of Hindostan, with all its ancient arts, civilisation, and elements of wealth and power.

The few short sentences regarding the unity and brotherhood of mankind—the responsibility of all, Emperor as well as peasant, to One God, of infinite power, justice, and mercy—seem to him to form the talisman of that mysterious success which is daily working such miracles before his eyes. If his own race, so rich in the accumulated intellectual power of many nations and many centuries, could only believe and learn this wonderful secret, what a future might yet be in store for India and her children!

And so, as he watches the good Padre mount his pony to leave the village, in doubt whether his day's preaching has produced the slightest permanent effect, the young Brahman feels that he at least has caught a glimpse of truths which may not only change his own future but the future of India. It is but one step on a toilsome and thorny path, but he has resolved to take it, and to inquire further, to get a Bible and read the books which the Padre says contain all the whole secret of his own faith, and to learn more from some friend who has attended a Mission school. And if the Truth has not lost its virtue during the many centuries since it was first proclaimed among the mountains of Judea, who shall set limits to its energy when preached in their own tongues and by their own countrymen among the myriads of India?

I have endeavoured, however imperfectly, to give the English reader some idea of a great moral and intellectual revolution which is going on in India, promoted by a hundred unconnected and unconscious agencies, and affecting alike the crowds in populous cities and—what is far more important—the rural population.

Not the least remarkable part of the revolution seems to me

to be the general unconsciousness of the agents employed as to the extent, if not the character, of the great changes they are working out.

Space only admits of a very brief reference to one or two questions immediately concerning our own Church.

I. What has our English Church had to do with all this great work?

Less, it must be confessed, in some ways than other Churches which are not so much bound by apparent ties of duty to preach the Gospel in Hindostan.

We may justly boast that we built the first Protestant church in India, and that the first Mission of the Reformed Western Churches was established by our venerable Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, at a time when it was the only Missionary Society in Protestant Europe.

But many generations elapsed before we did anything effectually or decidedly to follow up these first steps. And, when the work was resumed, nearly a century after its first commencement, several Nonconformist Societies, and even foreign nations, for a time were more active than the Church of England.

During the past fifty years much has been done by our two Church Societies, the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts and the Church Missionary Society, to remove this reproach from us. Their work will now bear comparison, in extent as well as in quality, with that of any other Christian Church in India; but it is not yet equal to what might be expected from the National Church of the rulers of India.

Let us frankly confess these shortcomings. Still, in considering what each Church in Christendom has done towards the great work of evangelizing India, we must, in fairness credit the Anglican Church with the good which has resulted from her position as the representative of State religion; more especially since it is this characteristic which has greatly hindered her action as a proselytizing Missionary Church. I do not now speak of the indirect benefits which result from her sending out bishops like Middleton and Heber, Wilson and Cotton, Carr and Corrie, or of the great body of well-educated and exemplary clergy, who have, as Government Chaplains, done so much, in many different ways, to aid Missionary work; nor of the support which good Churchmen have freely given to the

Missions of other than our own Church in India. I refer simply to the fact that the Church of England has, by her connection with the State, done most important service to the cause of Christianity in India, by saving the State from the reproach of godlessness.

The notions of an average intelligent native of India, on the subject of State religion, are generally well defined, and are often, I venture to think, as conformable to abstract reasoning as those of many men who are called statesmen in Europe. A godless State—a State which, in its corporate capacity, acknowledges no religion as its own, which deals with men as with herds of the lower animals—is, to the native of India generally, a fearful and unintelligible phenomenon. He is strongly possessed with a feeling which we are sometimes apt to stigmatize as timidity or servility. In one of ourselves we might call it genuine natural politeness. This often prevents him from expressing at all to Europeans his horror of an atheistical State. But the feeling, like some others equally important, is not the less strong because the Indian says little about it to his European friend. When they talk among themselves, however, or without reserve to a foreigner, intelligent Hindoos and Mohammedans generally agree that, in any model State, the rulers must have a God and a religion of their own. Men who have learned differently from modern European teachers will sometimes maintain modern European doctrines regarding the duty of the State to ignore religion; but, with this exception, all intelligent natives regard a State governed on such principles as a dominion of demons, and not of men.

What the State religion should be, and how it should deal with other religions than its own, are questions regarding which more diversity of opinion will naturally be expressed.

The Mohammedans generally hold that a faithful believer is bound to impose his creed on all within his power, and that the only limits of his duty in this respect are the limits of his power. The doctrines of pure and dominant Mohammedanism on this point have in India been much modified in past ages by force of external circumstances and by the more tolerant genius of Hindooism. But of late years there has been a great revival of the more simple and intolerant principles of Islam under the name of Wahabeeism. The force of this revival may, in India

especially, often derive strength from a kind of despair; but is not, on that account, less dangerous.

Hindoos, on the other hand, generally hold that, as long as the rulers of a State have a religion of their own, and leave their subjects free to follow their own convictions or traditions in religious matters, the State has no further duty with regard to religion. The cases are comparatively rare where the rulers and their Hindoo subjects are in entire accord regarding religion. Where they are, it may be admitted that the practice of Hindoo toleration is not theoretically perfect. Kine may not be killed nor may eggs or even oysters be eaten with impunity, where pure Hindooism is in the ascendant. But these cases are comparatively rare, and, in general, the practice, as well as the theory, of Hindoos is much more in accordance with the views of the more enlightened modern European writers, than the practice of many modern European rulers.

No portion of the great Proclamation of 1858 struck the natives of India so much, or found so ready a response in their own feelings and ideas, as the passages in which the Queen expressed her attachment to her own religion, and her determination to secure perfect toleration in religious matters for all her subjects. The gracious words to which Her Majesty then gave utterance have since become proverbial in India, and are habitually quoted by the natives as embodying the great fundamental principle of our rule. They seem to us, however, to express no more than has been, for generations past, the theory, if not always the practice, of our National Church. It is the spirit they embody which entitles that Church to a large share not only of the success of the past, but of the hopes of the future, as regards the evangelization of India.

Making every allowance for extreme opinions often held by men in high authority within her pale, no other Church has for so many generations exercised so much power in England and been at once so tolerant and so comprehensive. It may be said, with truth, that respect for the rights of private judgment is a national characteristic. It is so; and in proportion as the National Church gives expression to the national feeling in this respect will be its hold on the nation. No other Church could have held the same position of authority in India, and could, without sacrifice of its own principles, have abstained from using

that authority to repress and impede the action of other Churches.

Whether perfect and genuine indifferentism to all religions alike, be a condition of possible permanent stability for a State, is a problem yet to be solved by experience in Europe and America. In India it is at present, to my apprehension, clearly an impossibility, and Christians of other Churches, as well as the natives of India who are not Christians, may congratulate themselves that the National Church of their rulers is so deeply imbued with the national and Christian aversion to using temporal power for the purpose of influencing religious profession.

On this point, of course, the members of other Churches may think the view taken too favourable to our own Church; but few, I think, will be found to question the importance to the general cause of Christianity in India of having some Church which shall occupy the position of a State Church, and be officially recognised in that capacity by the Government of India.

Earnest Christians, who do not belong to our Church, and some who do, might advantageously reflect on the service thus rendered by the Church of England in India, before they join in an agitation which has been lately got up in India for abolishing all payments now made by the State to Ecclesiastical Establishments. The movement professes to be in the interest of the Indian Taxpayer. But unless instigated by European leaders, and supplied with arguments taken from the conflicts of rival Churches in our own country, I doubt whether the Hindoo Taxpayer would join in the cry. He is not yet prepared to dispense with the support of British bayonets, or the supervision of a British Government, and he would not find either to be the better adapted to his wants if emancipated from such control as the ministers of our religion exercise over their flocks.

To the Church itself, individually, the question is by no means one of such importance. Any advantage she derives from her connection with the State in India is dearly purchased by the restraints which are in consequence imposed on her free action. As a Missionary Church there can be no doubt she would be much more efficient if emancipated from all State control; whether the cause of Missions generally would not greatly

suffer, if all State connection with Christianity in India were abolished, is another question—and I for one believe that the results would be most detrimental.

We next come to the question—

II. What, as regards the future in India, are the prominent duties and responsibilities of the Church of England?

I do not think it in any way desirable to require or expect from the Government Chaplains in India more than the duties connected with their ministrations to the Christian servants of Government.

Those duties are amply sufficient, if fully performed, to occupy very completely the most active and energetic. Occasional leisure may be usefully devoted to works of Church extension and Church scholarship and study, which are as important to a Missionary Church as to any other, but for which actively employed Missionaries have little leisure or opportunity.

I have said how important it is, in my opinion, that the English Government should be known as a Government which has a religion of its own; and how valuable in this sense, as a public testimony, is the establishment of Ministers of religion maintained by Government as pastors to its own servants.

It seems to me scarcely less important that the duty of affording this testimony to the value of religion should be kept distinct from any active participation in Missionary work. Space only allows of a very brief glance at my reasons for thinking it essential that the two duties should be intrusted to different bodies of men.

Christianity is now acting in different ways, directly and indirectly, visibly and invisibly, as a solvent of those old bands which have for ages kept together society and civilisation in India. The revolution has hitherto been not only peaceful, but silent, and, perhaps to the mass of mankind, little perceptible.

This seems to me to render it imperative that the Government of England should occupy a position of absolute and unmistakeable independence as regards the Missionary agencies which are actively at work in effecting this revolution.

I do not believe that all the power of the Cæsars could add

any real force to those agencies; but I see much ground for fear lest Cæsar's intervention, however well meant, should mar or neutralise the result—even if it did not entirely stop the process.

We are sometimes told, on high authority, that the people of India are *in statu pupillari*—that it is the duty of a Christian Government to exert its parental authority by impressing on the youth of India the truths of Christianity without reference to the wishes of the natural parents of those who are to be educated.

This has always seemed to me a most dangerous doctrine—dangerous not only to the political peace and well-being of the country and to the liberties of its people, but to the truths themselves which we desire to have more generally received.

I speak not merely of the risk of political disturbance, and the danger of exciting active resistance—but of the certainty that such views, if successfully carried out, can only lead to a mental and spiritual tyranny of the most grievous kind.

The natural right of a Hindoo parent to direct the religious education of his child, while under years of discretion, is as sacred as that of the Christian parent. It cannot, in my opinion, be interfered with or controlled by the State without a breach of the first principles of that law of Christian liberty to which we ourselves would appeal, were we the subject party—nor without violence to the spirit of Christian equity which enjoins us to do to others as we would be done by.

Nor have we the poor excuse of a reasonable prospect of benefiting the cause we wish to promote. Cæsar's official patronage is in no way needed to strengthen the kingdom of Christ.

The Missionary agencies now at work in India have the means of offering the Gospel to the people of every part of India much more fully and freely than has ever been the case, with respect to such an area and such a population, in any part of the world, or at any other period of the world's history. The work can be only retarded or impaired, if not prevented, by worldly aid or worldly motives, by any form of State interference, or by what is intended as State assistance.

To secure perfect toleration, so that every man of full age should have full liberty of opinion and speech, as long as he

does no injury to his neighbour, is, I think, the proper work of a Christian State in India, and to it the State should be strictly confined.

There are a thousand ways in which the Christian servants of Government can personally aid the Missionary cause by their subscriptions, their sympathy, their prayers, and above all by the example of lives which shall be to all around them, whether Christians or not, a living epistle. It is no small privilege for the soldier or the ruler—the steward of earthly things—to be allowed thus to aid the great cause. If more than this is attempted, there is danger of earthly motives entering into the work. It is a post of honour to keep guard round the Tabernacle. It is not given to all to serve within the Sanctuary, or to do more than prepare materials for the Temple in which the Ark shall find shelter and rest.

In the great Missionary Societies connected with the Church of England every form of Missionary zeal may find expression and room for exercise, and no sort of aid can be reckoned superfluous—Missionaries of either sex, the most learned and the most simple, may find work which will task to the uttermost the talents which God has given them. For all there is ample room, and there is urgent need of such aid as the weakest can give.

Space does not admit of my entering on many subjects of great importance connected with what may be called the administrative details of Missionary work in India.*

---

* I do not think that any considerable improvement can be suggested in the general system of our two great Missionary Societies.

As regards the raising of funds, it is possible that a considerable economy might be effected, and the work greatly extended by adopting the plan in general use in France and other Roman Catholic countries, where large sums are collected for Missions and other purposes—almost absolutely without any deduction for the costs of collection. The system is this—

Each Curé selects one or more of his congregation to collect for the Mission a given sum, generally one sou each, from ten other persons, every week, and to bring the collections weekly to the Curé in church.

The collector is charged, if possible, to extend his operations by selecting one of his ten subscribers as an independent collector from ten others. He again may repeat the operation; and so on, so far as the numbers and means of the whole congregation will allow.

The sums thus collected weekly are sent by the Curé to the Bishop, and by him to the Central Societies at Paris or Lyons.

Vast sums are thus collected at very little cost of clerical labour in collecting, and are accounted for, as placed in the Treasuries of the various societies, with no other charge than a very small sum for printing.

As regards the application of the funds when collected, I know of no considerable improvement which could be

Whatever may be the agency employed, probably, as I have endeavoured above to show, in no part of the great Vineyard is there so fair a prospect of a great and early return for such

recommended, in the general management of the great Societies, unless it were by entrusting to the local administration in India rather more discretionary power to vary the mode of working so as to suit local and even personal peculiarities.

An extension of the Episcopate would greatly facilitate this, and every other branch of the Church's work. It would promote the creation of a great body of native clergy with a native episcopate of their own, and a native ritual, the three great present needs of our native Churches in India.

In all these respects the spirit of our Anglican Church forms seems extremely well suited to the wants of an Indian Church; but the forms themselves will need considerable variation from our Anglican forms, and can only be suitably settled by Synods in which the native element shall largely preponderate.

Suggestions are frequently made to increase the Missionary agency by encouraging Missionaries to place themselves under some sort of engagement to a celibate or ascetic life.

I would not venture to discuss the question as one of personal religion; but looking at it from a lay point of view, as regards efficiency as Missionary agents, I must declare my opinion to be wholly opposed to any belief in the superior energy of such agency.

No doubt there are times when any prudent soldier of the Cross would wish to be, like St. Paul, unencumbered by any worldly ties—however dear and sacred.

We see men in our own and other Churches whose energy and efficiency are conspicuously due to entire freedom from all calls of domestic and social duty. Probably every very active man has felt that there were times in his life when his efficiency for work of a Missionary character would have been greatly promoted by temporary freedom from all such calls on his time or thoughts.

But, in the long run, and looking to the majority of cases, and to the whole of the work the Christian Church has to do in India, my opinion is decidedly against the superior efficiency of celibate or ascetic agency.

We see and hear much of its power when efficient; but I am convinced, from close personal observation, that the percentage of inefficient agents is, in quiet times, far greater among celibates and ascetics than among Missionaries who are permitted to marry, and who live as our Protestant Missionaries generally do in India, frugally and soberly, after the manner of life to which the same men and women would be accustomed in any active and laborious calling.

In judging of this question, few are aware of or calculate the enormous sacrifice of life, health, and efficiency which celibacy and asceticism, as practised by the active Roman Missionaries, entail in India.

We usually think and speak of such men as martyrs. But their title to the crown cannot be beyond dispute, unless the necessity, or at least the utility of the conduct which causes loss of health and life be clearly established.

In India especially, above all countries, it would be difficult to prove the superior efficacy of celibate and ascetic agency.

It enters largely into the machinery of almost all the most popular Creeds in India, and is often held in high honour and esteem by the vulgar; but on the whole it fails, for the same reasons which appear to me to cause it to fail everywhere else. It is at variance with the Laws of Human Nature, and however its restrictions may help to stimulate energy in some directions, no such agent can thoroughly understand mankind as they are, and consequently he cannot thoroughly know his own business.

I am speaking of course as a layman, without reference to any but secular judgments of success or failure; but the opinion I have expressed has particular reference to our dealing with Brahmans, probably the most successful on the whole of all sacerdotal bodies—and they have found by experience that celibacy and asceticism do not in the

labour as may be applied in obedience to the commands of the Divine Master and in accordance with His spirit.

In no part of the world, I believe, would it be possible to realise so fully the brotherhood of all who bear the name of Christ.

In India, as elsewhere, it must needs be that offences come—there are, and there probably ever will be, divisions and discords such as sadly hinder the work of the Gospel. They are often such as cause shame to all sensitive Christians. But, as compared with our own country, there is little bitterness of strife among earnest men of different ways of thinking. In the face of an idolatry such as that which pervades Hindostan, all minor differences among Christians sink into comparative insignificance.

Is it impossible that in this, as in other ways, there may be a reflex action from foreign Missions on the Home Churches, which may in some sense repay what India will owe to the Churches of the West?

We know how much active Mission work, whether in our own or any foreign country, stimulates the inward life of any Missionary Church. It can hardly fail also to foster the spirit of Christian charity: many a man whose existence has been embittered by the internal discords of Christendom may learn in mission work how all-important are the points on which all Christians are agreed; how comparatively trifling are the questions which often, in this country, divide us from each other.

Again, as the Rev. Dr. Kay well observed, the Catholic Church cannot attain its proper normal condition in any one part, till it has embraced within itself the whole range of humanity.

---

long run, and with the greater part of mankind, add to their power.

This may be partly due to the views which Hindoos generally take of marriage; and which ought to be taken into account when considering how the mass of the people are to be acted on.

There is, of course, much diversity of views among so many millions; but the usual Hindoo view is that the pair—a man and woman suitably matched—is the perfect human being; a single man or woman is an imperfect being. Celibacy (and asceticism also) has abundant honour among other forms of self-inflicted human suffering, or of exemption from human infirmity; but, in any other point of view it is a reproach and an evidence of inborn evil, deserving punishment either for personal or inherited sins.

Of course, in any Christian Church, the question will be argued on other and higher grounds. But it has also its mundane and secular side, and to that only I now refer.

"Every nation," he observes, "has its contribution of moral qualities to give to the Catholic Church. I am persuaded that the view which makes the Greek, Latin, and Gothic races to have exhausted all that is of essential importance to the rehabilitation of humanity is a profound error. I believe that the Hindoo, for instance, has many noble qualities; lofty idealism; singular strength of self-devotion; marvellous power of endurance; along with natural aptitude for many of the gentler virtues, as meekness, tenderness, delicacy—virtues which we may not rank very highly, but on which our Saviour has stamped His indelible approbation in the Sermon on the Mount."

These virtues, and others akin to them, such as patience and temperance, seem peculiarly calculated to find exceptional development in such a Church as we may imagine taking the place of the present dark superstitions of India.

This brings us back to the question put by the Brahmoist teacher, "What shall be the Church of the Future?"

We may not, like him, hope to see on earth any Universal Church, in which all Nations and Languages shall join. Our visions of such Catholic Unity must refer to a period when the Heavens and the Earth, as they now are, shall have been changed; but we may hope, and at no distant period, to see a great Christian Church in India, with distinct National characteristics of its own, but with features which may be recognised by all Catholic Christians as betokening true Catholic Unity with the Great Head of our Faith. It would be vain to speculate on what are likely to be the distinctive features of such an Indian Church, but we may be confident that they will be no mere copy of the Churches which have grown up in and around Europe; and that, while holding the Truths which are to be gathered from the teaching of Our Lord and His Apostles, the framers of the Church constitution of India will find no necessity for copying peculiarities which have been impressed on so many of the older Churches of Christendom by the circumstances under which they were originally organized, in communities at that time quite as barbarous as the least civilised portions of India are now.

We have, as a nation, formidable debtor and creditor accounts of various kinds with India, and it is often difficult to say on which side the net balance lies. But there is one obligation

which seems to me to outweigh all others in magnitude and importance, and that is the obligation to provide for India some substitute for those social ties which are dissolved by the unavoidable action of our rule.

This sketch affords but a very imperfect idea of the number and activity of the agencies set in motion by an administration like ours. In spite of our most earnest wishes, they often tend surely but silently to break down not only caste, but all old systems of municipal organization.

The institutions which we thus help to dissolve have preserved the country from anarchy, and maintained civilisation and social order under circumstances such as would have reduced any part of Europe or America to barbarism. Nothing, I believe, has been further from our intention than to loosen such social ties; but the result seems inevitable, and is being brought about at this moment with a rapidity of which few who have not lived much among the people of India can be aware. The process could not be arrested if we were to leave India to-morrow; the spell of caste, and all that is connected with caste, has been broken, and whatever of weal or woe may be in store for the India of the Future, the India which we knew a generation ago, frozen into forms which had remained unchanged for so many centuries, can never be seen again.

Have we no obligations to India of any duty to be rendered, bound up with the awful gifts of freedom which we have already conferred on her? Whether we intended it or not, we have sown the seeds of revolution, physical, intellectual, moral, and religious; and who amongst us shall venture to prophesy what may be the results ere another generation has passed over us?

There seems to me to be but one gift which imagination could devise, and that is the gift of those truths which are the real secret of the power we exercise on other nations. They have virtue to bind as well as to loose; to draw together by the bonds of Christian love and brotherhood, as well as to set free from the fetters of Satan. They, and they alone, can render the people of India capable of that degree of self-government which seems the only condition on which India can be retained as a portion of the British Empire, and preserved from falling a prey to intestine discords, and the domination of foreign

powers, whose scourges of scorpions would speedily cast into oblivion the harshest records of British rule.

Should it be permitted to England to leave Christian Truth as our legacy to the people of Hindostan, our rule there will not lack a memorial more enduring than her ancient kings have graven on her rocks, or her ancient conquerors burnt into the memories of her people.

H. B. E. Frere.

Christmas Eve, 1869.

Note (p. 346).—In the first edition of this work the name of the preacher whose words are quoted in p. 346 seqq. was accidentally omitted. Since then Baboo Kesub-Chunder Sen has visited England, and personally expounded his views in many public addresses. Four of his most comprehensive discourses delivered in Calcutta have also been republished here by Allen and Co., Waterloo Place, and an excellent summary of his opinions and doctrine has been given by Miss Collet in the 'Contemporary Review' for February last, and since republished in a separate form as 'Indian Theism and its relation to Christianity.' To these I would refer any reader who wishes to judge for himself how far the Baboo's views represent Christianity or Hinduism as hitherto taught; or as fairly deducible from any generally acknowledged standard expositions of either religion; and how far such views are likely to be found, by the world at large, or by any great division of it, a sufficient substitute for the Gospel which Christian Missionaries, for close on two thousand years, have been striving to preach to every people.

ESSAY IX.

THE CHURCH AND EDUCATION.

By ALFRED BARRY, D.D.; D.C.L., Oxon.

Principal of King's College, London; Examining Chaplain to the
Lord Bishop of Bath and Wells; and
Formerly Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge.

CONTENTS OF ESSAY IX.

The alternative of Reform or Revolution.

- I. The Present State of Church Education
  - (A) Among the poorer classes.
    - (*a*) Its strong points:
      - Increase of schools and scholars.
      - Average of attendance.
    - (*b*) Its weak points:
      - Insufficient number of schools.
      - Defect in test by inspection.
      - Defect in result of general intelligence.
  - (B) Among the middle classes.
    - Grammar Schools.
    - New Church Schools.
    - Extension of operation of National Society.
    - Need of greater encouragement by State and Church.
- II. Reforms Needed—
  - (*a*) In the initiation and maintenance of schools.
  - (*b*) In the attendance of scholars.
    - Direct compulsion undesirable and impracticable.
    - Indirect compulsion desirable and sufficient.
- III. The Three Systems—
  - (A) The Secular System.
  - (B) The General Religious System.
  - (C) The Present System.
    - Its moral claim on public faith.
    - Its modification by Conscience Clause.
    - Its economy.
    - Its security for religious education;
    - Its security for religious liberty.

THE CHURCH AND EDUCATION.

The subject of Church Education, always of great importance, is now assuming an aspect of graver consequence than ever. It is nearly certain that some measure will speedily be brought forward to meet the acknowledged deficiencies, practical and theoretical, of our present systems; it is earnestly to be desired by all who really care for Education, that such a measure should deal with the problem in some decided and effective manner. It is, therefore, the duty of all who believe that these actual present systems, with all these acknowledged defects, best meet the requirements of the case itself and the special circumstances of our English people, to consider what modifications, what extensions, what developments they can admit of, in order to enable them thoroughly to hold and work the ground which at present they but imperfectly occupy.

At periods of transition there are two dangers almost equally formidable. The one is the danger of the merely revolutionary spirit, which ignores the solid growth of the past in its passion for novelty, and neglects all the history and circumstances of the case in its zeal for theoretical completeness and simplicity. The other is that of a blind conservatism, which refuses to consider the exigencies of the time, and shows an ignorant patience of existing defects, and which accordingly, in things social, political, and ecclesiastical, drifts on with its eyes shut, till it finds itself in the rapids, and then perhaps in desperation thrusts wildly on the vessel which it is now too late to hold back or to direct. If I venture to dwell more emphatically on the second of these dangers, it is because it is the one more likely to threaten the readers of these pages. I can hardly expect that they will in any degree commend themselves to the party of revolution.

It is impossible in the compass of a short Essay to do more than touch upon a few salient points of a great subject: it is

inevitable that the writer must state some conclusions without exhibiting their proofs, and pronounce on controverted points without any full survey of the controversy. It is only in the conviction, not only of the paramount importance of the present crisis, but also of the pressing and unquestionable duty of every Churchman to consider the great question for himself, and to rouse his fellow-Churchmen to a sense of its importance, that I venture to treat it at all under these circumstances of inevitable difficulty.

My object is to show that, in this, as in other branches of Church polity and action, we have but one of two alternatives before us—Reform or Revolution. The latter process is simple enough. But those who would be true Reformers have a more difficult task. They must consider the past and the present,—what the institution to be reformed has done and is doing: they must contemplate the future under changes of circumstances brought about by the conditions of general progress and the needs of the institution itself.

I. What, then, is the present position of Church Education? The answer must divide itself into three parts. We must consider the state of Church Education in what are roughly but not inconveniently termed the "Lower, Middle, and Upper Schools." These terms are not applied invidiously; they are used with a full consciousness of their theoretical imperfection and incorrectness. But, as a matter of fact, there are three great classes of schools to be considered. There are, first, the schools which educate the children of the poor, free or with low school-fees, depending principally on voluntary subscriptions and Government aid. There are, next, the Middle-Class Schools, in which the proportion of the two sources of income is reversed, which are or ought to be mainly self-supporting (by endowment or school-fees), but which nevertheless require some extraneous help. There are, lastly, the Schools of the Upper Class, some of which, indeed, are aided by endowments, but which are virtually self-supporting, and for which accordingly no one thinks of asking either private subscriptions or aid from the public purse.

In order to narrow the subject to that which is of most pressing importance, this last class of schools will be passed

over in these pages. They may be very safely left to themselves, and to the law of supply and demand. The Government have a right (and I think are bound to exercise that right) to see that such schools, or, at any rate, such as have endowments are doing their work efficiently, with due regard at once to the principles of their foundation and the necessary modifications dictated by historical change. But beyond this they need not be interfered with. The schools are pretty sure to assume a "denominational" character, with a good deal of liberality in the working of its system: the influence of the Church and even of the clergy is still paramount in them. If, in some, religious teaching is vague or negative, it is because of the perplexity which pervades the whole of Church action and doctrine at the present day, and which will never be rectified till the Church has some power of self-government and progressiveness, and our present condition, under a rigid system practically disregarded, be exchanged for some other system, wide and elastic, but capable of commanding and, if need be, of enforcing obedience.

(A) Let us consider, first, what is the condition of Church Education among the poorest classes. Fortunately, the National Society* has enabled us to form an opinion on two important points—on the degree of progress already made, and the actual opportunities of instruction which are within the reach of our poor. Known as these statistics may be to many of my readers, a glance at them is here absolutely necessary.

(*a*) The progress, if estimated by the number of scholars on our registers, or the number in actual average attendance, is remarkable and most encouraging.

Thus—

In 1831,	of a population of	13,994,460,	there were	380,428	week-day scholars.
1837	,,	15,103,778	,,	470,188	,,
1847†	,,	17,150,018	,,	978,423	,,
1857	,,	19,256,516	,,	1,241,243	,,
1867	,,	21,554,711	,,	1,654,437	,,

If we estimate the results by percentage, it will appear that Church Schools educated—

---

* 'Statistics of Church-of-England Schools for the Poor in England and Wales for the years 1866 and 1867.' From this the quotations in the text are made.

† On this occasion, night-schools were for the first time included.

In 1831,	one in	36·7	of the population.
1837	,,	32·1	,,
1847	,,	17·5	,,
1857	,,	15·5	,,
1867	,,	13	,,

On these tables two remarks must be made.

First. It will be observed that the greatest step of all was taken in the ten years 1837-1847. How is this to be accounted for?

"(1). In this period the Committee of Council on Education was appointed, and the State concentrated its efforts and directed its great means and influence towards the multiplying of schools for the poorer classes.

"(2). In this period a general movement was inaugurated by the National Society for establishing colleges for the training of teachers.

"(3). The 'Special Fund' of the National Society, the object of which was to multiply Church-of-England Schools in mining and manufacturing districts" (which raised in two years 150,000*l.*) "was created."

It is clear from this how much has been done, and may be done again, by a combined effort on the part of the Government and of the Church authorities.

Next. In order to estimate the significance of the fact that these primary Church-of-England Schools educate 1 in 13 of the whole population, it should be known that the whole number of day-scholars, in all kinds of schools, was, in 1867, 2,535,462, or 1 in 7·7. And this includes scholars in "private schools, grammar and collegiate schools, ragged schools, orphan asylums, workhouses, naval and military schools," in all of which Church teaching occupies an important place, and in many of which it is largely predominant.

If we examine the existing opportunities for education open to our poorer classes, we find that, out of 14,709 parishes and ecclesiastical districts in England and Wales, there were 13,016 which had schools of their own, 1355 which had no schools, but were supplied with education in adjoining parishes,* and only

---

* "Many of these parishes, even parishes having large populations, are in cities and towns, and provided for . . . by *central* establishments. For example, in Exeter, Colchester, York, Chichester, there are central schools, under combined management, which are attended by the children of several

338 which had neither schools of their own, nor schools within a moderate distance.* It is unnecessary to state that both these classes, and especially the last, are composed almost entirely of parishes with very small populations.

Nor is the average of attendance of scholars on the registers unsatisfactory. The average daily attendance in the day schools is 1,081,268 out of 1,505,856 on the registers, or 71·8 per cent.—an average considerably above that reported by Mr. Fraser in the Schools in the United States and Canada. And it must be remembered that the 28·2 per cent. of absentees "are not constant absentees, but only intermittently or temporarily absent, and the 28·2 per cent. absent from school to-day may be there to-morrow, to be replaced by a different set of absentees—a different 28·2 per cent. In short, if the 28·2 per cent. were not fairly regular in attendance, their names would not be retained on the School registers at all."

From these simple data it is impossible not to draw the conclusion that the present system of Church Education has done wonders in the cause, has produced already a state of things far from unsatisfactory, has in it a vitality and a power of expansion, which cannot be questioned and could hardly be replaced. If our Statesmen proceed on the principle, which has made our Constitution practical and durable, they cannot and will not destroy such existing materials, especially since it cannot be questioned that they would outrage the opinion and principles of a very large class, if not the majority, of Englishmen in so doing. They may create new classes of schools, but they will certainly not extinguish the old ones, unless the managers of these existing schools prove to be hopelessly impracticable in their demands and in their refusals.

(*b*) This first point we may consider, as practically decided. The system is worth reform and improvement. We must ask next, Does it need them?

---

parishes. In London there are distinct sets of large schools .... purposely provided to meet the requirements of several parishes.... In Bedford there are two or three large schools under trustees, which supply the poor of the whole of that town with education. The city of Norwich .... contains 36 parishes, but a consideration of their populations shows that each could not be expected to have its own separate school."

* Out of the 1355 parishes named above, 1329 had schools so near, that 2½ miles was the maximum distance walked to school; and in 633 1½ mile was the maximum distance.

The answer must unhesitatingly be given in the affirmative. In the first place, it is obvious that the existing arrangements do not, for some reason or other, reach large masses of the population at all. The Church Schools educate altogether 1,654,437; the British and Foreign Schools, Wesleyan Schools, &c., and the Roman Catholic Schools, probably about 550,000;* there remain, according to the best calculations, at least 500,000 children of our poorer classes, who are not at any public School whatever. And, if we consider the rate of increase of our schools during the last twenty years (since 1847) we do not see any reason to believe that it will, without some new and special development, so far overtake the growth of population as to remove this deficiency. Between 1837 and 1847 the number of scholars in the Church Schools alone was more than doubled, and the average rose from 1 in 32·1 to 1 in 17·5 of the population, because a great effort was made on the part of the Government and the Church to extend and improve the previously existing arrangements. It is impossible not to see that the time has now come, when another great effort must be made; it requires no over-sanguine estimate of our powers to conclude, that, if such an effort is made, it will be at least as successful as the last. Those who look upon Education as a religious work, who remember that every one of those children, massed together in the results of an average, is an immortal soul for whom Christ died, cannot be excused, if they sit down quietly under the present state of things, or oppose the making of any new effort at all, because they cannot tell what direction it may take.

But this is not all, nor nearly all. It is true that we had in 1867, 11,972 Church Schools; but of what quality are they? how far can we know that they are doing the work which we desire that they should do? Now there meets us here one fatal and decisive fact, which we cannot possibly explain away. Of these Schools, 5017, educating 947,207 children,† were under

---

* These numbers are calculated by taking the number of children in schools unconnected with the Church which are under inspection, and guessing from it the number of those in all such schools, inspected or uninspected. The result is probably in excess of the actual fact.

† These figures are taken from the 'National Society's Report for 1867.' By the Privy Council Return for 1868–69, I observe that the Inspected Schools now number 5,781, having an average attendance of 765,319 children, and having present at examination 943,458. The increase, it will be observed, is considerable.

Government inspection and received annual grants from the State as being efficient. But no less than 6955 Schools, educating 707,230 children, were unaided by annual grants, and of these there were only about 535 schools, educating about 39,750 children, which were "Simply Inspected" Schools, that is, were under inspection, as having received grants for building, but did not receive an Annual Grant, because they did not fulfil the required conditions. Now of uninspected Schools it is obvious that we have no test whatever, by which we may determine whether they are or are not efficient. They may be excellent: but they may be worthless,—perhaps, so far worse than worthless, that they are mere shams, occupying ground which ought to be better filled. Even the "Simply Inspected" Schools are liable to suspicion *a priori*, because they cannot earn the Annual Grant under the simple conditions laid down by the Government. For be it remembered that, if a School does not receive a grant, the fault lies with itself and its managers: there is no hesitation whatever on the part of the Government. If every School in the Kingdom fulfils the required Conditions, the Privy Council have no option, but to make the grant, even though they have to face the House of Commons, or (what is perhaps even more terrible) the Chancellor of the Exchequer, with a demand, which must double the gross Annual Parliamentary grant. Why then do the Schools hang back?

In some cases, but comparatively few at present, the managers have conscientious reasons, which will not allow their acceptance of the Government Grant; and their Schools may be just as good as those which receive it. But in 99 cases out of 100, they do not receive a grant, because they cannot fulfil the conditions, in other words, because they are not good enough to deserve it.

For what are these conditions? The preliminary conditions are simply these: first, a schoolroom, properly built and arranged, so as to meet needful sanitary and educational requirements; next, a certificated teacher (and, be it remembered, under the Revised Code, a teacher, who has not been trained in one of the Normal Colleges, may nevertheless obtain a certificate by examination).

The subsequent conditions are, that the school must have a certain number of children in regular attendance, and must

pass its scholars before the inspector in reading, writing, and arithmetic, and, if its managers choose, in certain higher subjects.

Why are these conditions not fulfilled?

In the working of the subsequent conditions there may be difficulty and even hardship in detail; it is probably true that, in correcting the tendency to display in high subjects, the Revised Code has erred in the opposite direction, and concentrated too much attention and time on the lowest.* But no one can question that in the main they are simply tests of efficiency, and that, if a school fails to fulfil them, it deserves no support or consideration. Turn then to the preliminary conditions.

The first is perfectly reasonable and necessary. If a parish cannot raise funds enough to gain Government assistance in the erection of sufficient school buildings, it is clear that its educational ardour is very small, that the system at present in vogue is failing in that particular parish.† But, after all, the difficulty does not lie here. It is comparatively easy to raise funds once for all; a good school under a good teacher is pretty sure to succeed in housing itself satisfactorily. As a matter of fact, we find that of the schools in England and Wales failing to obtain annual grants, 689 are known to fulfil this condition, and probably others either do so or might easily be made to do so.

The one condition, which in a large class of cases is unfulfilled, is the employment of a certificated teacher, *i.e.* of a teacher of whose efficiency there is, at least, one reasonable and unquestionable test. Now, unfortunately, there is no doubt that the short-sighted policy of the Revised Code has very greatly diminished the supply of trained teachers. The Training Colleges are fewer in number, and even those which exist are not

---

* The testimony on this subject is too extensive and too varied to be disbelieved. I observe that the Association of London Church Schoolmasters proposes, among other things, to increase the proportion of payment for attendance and for passing in higher subjects, and diminish that given for the passing in the reading, writing, and arithmetic only.

† I believe that there are some occasional hardships, arising from over-rigidity of system, in the case of schools built before the present Minute was framed, and incapable of adaptation to it, though not inadequate for their purpose. These may soon be remedied if the Privy Council will but feel that the "Department" is made for the schools and not the schools for the Department.

full; there may be, perhaps, some signs of recovery in these respects, but the profession of the schoolmaster has suffered a discouragement, from which recovery must be very slow. There was a time when the supply of trained teachers might have been trusted as sufficient and tending to increase. Now, this is so no longer, and we have to rue the partial destruction, for economy's sake, of an important educational power. Still, so far as our present consideration goes, this does not explain the difficulty, for (as has been already said) any teacher, trained or otherwise, if he be rightly educated for his work, can obtain a certificate by merely proving his qualifications. I do not enquire whether this does, or does not, lower the value of the certificate, nor enter into the question, on which there can be but little serious difference of opinion, whether the status given by the certificate should be maintained. All we are concerned with is the fact. Any school may get a certificated teacher. Why are so many schools without one?

The answer is simply this:—"Because they will not pay for one, or because through local influence and jobbery unfit persons are placed in the teacher's place." By the National Society's Report, we find that the average payment to a certificated master was 94*l.* 3*s.* 7*d.* per annum, with or without a house; the average payment to an uncertificated master was 62*l.* 13*s.* In a report of H. M. Inspector of Schools for Bucks and Herts (quoted by Canon Girdlestone in his paper at Exeter), we find that he is compelled still to note many schools in his district "as carried on by crippled labourers, by rustics just saved from the workhouse, by waifs of misfortune from different walks of life, by superannuated ladies' maids, by old women, who can neither hear, nor see, nor write, nor spell, nor cast up simple figures;" and he adds, "strange to say in schools such as these, benevolence is found to lavish inordinately what it too often denies in moderation to schools properly constituted and well conducted." Now, it is needless to say, that what the teacher is, that, speaking generally, the school will be; and that, if we find half the Church schools in the country employing teachers of whose efficiency we have no real test at all, we cannot be satisfied that these schools are themselves efficient; we cannot but feel grave doubt whether in these parishes our system is working as it ought to work.

But it so happens that the "Simply Inspected" schools throw some invaluable light on this part of the subject. There is, of course, infinite variety of excellence among them; but the general verdict of the inspectors is that they are decidedly inferior to the schools which, being under certificated teachers, receive annual grants.* Yet these are naturally the *élite* of the unaided schools; the very fact that they possess good buildings and enjoy the advantage of inspection proves that they are superior to the average of those wholly uninspected. We may not unfairly apply an *a fortiori* argument in this case, and infer still more decided inefficiency in the mass of the 6400 schools which do not possess these advantages.

It is madness to shut our eyes to the importance of these facts. At present, we are not greatly concerned with the causes of this failure or the proposals for remedying it. But one thing is only too plain, that there is failure somewhere, and that our present system does not work as it ought to work, and as, if it is to continue, it must be made to work.

And if we look at the actual results produced by our schooling, if we estimate the general intelligence (especially in the districts mainly dependent on our elementary schools) in comparison with the standard attained in many continental nations and in the United States, we shall be almost inevitably led to the same mixed result. We shall find that the system has done much—so much as to deserve our respect and consideration,—but that still very much remains to be done, more than that which, without reform and development, it will be capable of doing.

There are some passages of great interest bearing on this subject in the Rev. J. Fraser's Report (to the School Commission of 1864) on the Common School system of the United States and Canada—the more valuable because he is an adherent of the denominational system, and is keenly alive to the great

---

* See 'Report of Educational Committee of Privy Council, 1868-69,' pp. xiv.-xvii. The general result of the testimony from no less than ten inspectors is summed up in the words of one: "Compared with the schools under certificated teachers, none were equal to the best, very few were on a level with the 'fair,' the greater number ranked with the 'moderate,' and some were positively bad. The organization was, as a rule, clumsy and unskilful; the instruction unsound and incapable of standing the test of individual examination; and the discipline wanting in smartness and method."

defects of the "non-religious" system of the United States. Again and again he expresses his strong feeling of the great superiority in intelligence which can be traced, both in the schools and in the classes which they educate, in the United States, as compared with England. "I confess" (he says in conclusion) "to the conviction, growing more and more in my own mind, strengthened too by what I have heard and seen in America, that what we need more of in England, is *intelligent* education—a real quickening of the minds of the people. And I say this quite as much in the interests of religion as in the prospect of political changes. . . . *The* difficulty I find, as a country clergyman, in teaching and preaching to a mixed adult congregation lies in the slow and heavy intellectual movement of the mass of my hearers; their scanty vocabulary; their inability to appreciate an argument or follow a train of thought; their want of general and broad mental culture. I do not think that it can be maintained that the religious teaching in our schools has produced religious intelligence or religious stability among our people."

I believe that what is here calmly and forcibly expressed by one who has every claim to be esteemed an authority on the subject, will be endorsed by all who know anything of the actual educational state of the masses of our population. Let the causes be what they may, it is certain that far greater educational exertion must be made: and we must look to our present system to see whether it will stand the strain of greater power, whether it will admit of greater elasticity and development—whether, in fact, it is to stand at all or be swept away for some wider and more general scheme.

(B) If from the Education of the Poor we turn to the Education of the Middle Classes, and examine the group of schools which should be mainly self-supporting, but which still require some secondary aid, we shall not be able to draw even so favourable a picture as this.

(*a*) Certainly, in regard to what is (somewhat barbarously) termed the "Upper Middle" class, we shall find that very much is already done for Education by the Grammar Schools of the country (in which the needful secondary aid is mostly derived from endowment), and we cannot but hope, and that with the greatest confidence, that very much more will be

done under the provisions of the "Endowed Schools Act." In these old Grammar Schools the influence of the Church is predominant, and, unless the clergy and Churchmen generally are blind to the signs and necessities of the times, I have no fear that under the New Act it will cease to be so. And if the endowments be rightly used, and if the inevitable Government Inspection be sensibly conducted, so as to insist that the schools meet the wants of the class chiefly requiring them, without destroying those opportunities of higher teaching which have made these schools of pre-eminent importance, as means for the fusion of classes and for the elevation of individual boys of greater ability and higher aspirations than their fellows—then one great step will have been taken for Middle-class education, and we may not unreasonably wait till we see the effects which it produces.

Nor can we look without considerable admiration and hopefulness on the movement now going on for the establishment of good Middle-class Schools on Church principles, such as those which are associated with the name, as they are mainly advanced by the energy, of Mr. Woodard. It has been found that by the secondary aid of the same spirit of munificence, which created our old endowed foundations, such schools may be made self-supporting, while they give an excellent education, on terms which bring it easily within reach of the class in question. If only such schools can be kept clear of party spirit and the exclusive dominance of one class of theological views*—and (we must add) if they are made really "public Schools," governed (that is) by a fixed constitution, so as to be free from individual despotism, and to give rightful power and influence to all who are devoting themselves to the work,†—then we may consider them, as contributing one more important element to the solution of our present difficulties, and honour the men

---

* In saying this, I refer to the body of such schools *as a whole*. We must expect that energetic steps of advance will often be connected with "extreme" opinions; it may be said that one great advantage of such opinions is that they prevent stagnation, and that calm and moderate minds are better able to organize than to effect conquests. But surely all parties should be represented in the movement: a party which confines itself to objection and protest, or to a "masterly inactivity," is self-condemned.

† The public has (I think) no sufficient means of knowing how far the S. Nicolas' Schools fulfil this latter condition; it would probably increase the support given to them, if such knowledge were possible.

who have shown what can be done on Church principles in the nineteenth century.

But, when we turn to the "Lower Middle Class"—to those who will not send their children to our "National Schools," and yet do not desire, perhaps cannot afford, such an education as that given by the schools just referred to, it is quite certain; first, that the education of this class is worse, in proportion to its needs and its importance, than that of almost any other, and next, that in it the influence of the Church is almost unfelt. In this quarter it is that the exertions of Churchmen are at this moment especially needed. The Rev. Canon Gregory deserves our gratitude, as for other good services, so especially for calling attention to this great want, for showing by his own practical experience how it may be met, for inducing the National Society to extend its operations and raise a special fund for the encouragement and inspection of such Middle-class Schools, and for labouring (as Chairman of the Middle-class School Committee*) to make the working of this new and important department practical and efficient. A public meeting was held at Willis's Rooms this year, under the presidency of Mr. Gathorne Hardy, with the support of Lord Carnarvon, Lord Lyttelton, the Bishops of Oxford and Gloucester, and Mr. Hubbard—names of no mean authority—to further the scheme; and it can hardly be that an enterprise so supported, tending, in a plain practical way, to meet an acknowledged need, can fail to bear very important fruit. The schools (be it remembered) are to be self-supporting. The class for whom they are intended can afford to pay for their children's education: they are willing enough to do so, and, in fact, do so now, though in many cases their money is wasted on most inefficient schools. What they want is impetus—encouragement, direction, and inspection—and this it cannot be difficult for the Church to supply through the National Society or by other organizations. The field is open now: whether it will long remain so, may be questioned. Above all things it is necessary that the ground be occupied at once, in view of the probable movements of the future.

---

* The Report of this Committee will be found in the 'National Society's Report for 1869,' pp. 29–35. I must also mention the very interesting 'Letter of Canon Gregory to His Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury' (Rivingtons, 1865) on the subject.

Our survey, then, of this sphere of "Middle-class Education" leads to the same general result as that of the Lower Schools—a strong conviction of the value of the existing materials and machinery, as having proved already its power and its vitality—an equally strong conviction that the time has come when once more some stronger motive power must be applied. Granted that we must make decided and immediate progress, it remains to ask what steps in the way of such progress are necessary.

(*b*) In the sphere of Middle-class Education I hardly think that much material help is wanted. All that the Government need do, and ought to do, is to see that endowments are fairly and economically applied; to provide some security (in consideration of the great national interests at stake) that the schools be well administered and taught, probably by inspection and by requiring some certificate from all teachers who have no University degree; and to meet the "religious difficulty" without secularising the schools. All that the Church need do is to awake to the need of using her strength in this neglected sphere; to co-operate heartily with the Government in all provisions for securing efficiency in the existing schools; to establish and encourage Church Middle-class schools, both for day-boys and boarders, which, when once started, should be mainly self-supporting; and (I should add) to do so with a frank recognition of the present religious condition of the country, providing for unfettered religious teaching, and at the same time respecting the rights of conscience.* If this be done, the question will probably solve itself; at any rate, it is not one which presses for any but gradual solution, and it is, therefore, one in which crude and hasty legislation would be unpardonable.

II. It is far otherwise with the education of the Poor. There we want more motive power: we cannot afford to wait; and we

---

* The distinction drawn in the Endowed Schools Bill between day-scholars and boarders, seems one of much practical good sense. For the former, it enacts a distinct "conscience clause," allowing their absence from any religious lesson or religious worship by desire of their parents; for the latter it provides that, where objection to such exemption (which would interfere seriously with all domestic arrangements and introduce much religious disorganization) is made by the managers of the school, the scholar for whom such exemption is asked, shall be arranged for as a day-scholar, without prejudicing his rights in the school.

certainly shall not wait over another session of Parliament without seeking to supply it.

The "voluntary system" has been strained to the utmost; the results, as we have seen, are marvellous, and yet plainly insufficient—insufficient taken collectively, still more insufficient through the fact that their action is partial, and that the present system leaves unaided the very places which most require aid.

(*a*) Thus, in the establishment of new schools, the Government will make no grant exceeding "the total amount voluntarily contributed by proprietors, residents, or employers of labour, *in* the parish where the school is situated, or *within* a radius of four miles from the school." Subscriptions may be obtained from a distance, to cover the balance of expenditure over and above the public grant and local contribution; but the local contribution is a *sine quâ non.* It follows from this that where the parish is poor, containing no rich proprietors, or where the rich proprietors (or proprietor) stand aloof and decline to contribute, there either no local contribution or a very inadequate one will be raised, and the Government aid will be practically withheld. On the other hand, where the parish is rich and the proprietors liberal—where, in fact, the school could very well be built by local contributions alone—there the Government aid is given abundantly. The object of the scheme was to "put on the screw," and to call out voluntary local action. It has succeeded admirably; and the value of its success must be measured not only by the pounds, shillings, and pence actually drawn from individual pockets, but by the degree of local interest which it has evoked, and the natural resolution in each district to secure the efficiency of what it has paid to create. But there is a growing feeling now that its work is done and its time past; it has pressed unequally, and in some cases very hardly, especially on the clergy, who have had to beg from others and yet to contribute unduly themselves;* it is thought that it must give way to some regular and equitable imposition of the burden.

---

* I cannot but think that the clergy should not say too much on this subject. If they bear too much of the burden, it is often because they are too jealously careful of their own exclusive influence in the school, which many of those who complain would be very unwilling to relinquish. When a clergy-

And what is true in regard to the first establishment of the school is true in regard to what is acknowledged to be far more difficult—its continued maintenance. The average cost per head for education, in a good inspected and aided school, is about 1*l.* 5*s.* 9*d.* per annum; of this, under the most favourable circumstances in the aided schools, the grant under the Revised Code might amount to 12*s.*—in point of fact, it amounts to about 8*s.* 3*d.*; the remaining 17*s.* 6*d.* must be met by school fees and annual subscriptions. Taking the school fees on the average at 8*s.* 4*d.*, and the endowments at about 10*d.*, the subscriptions must provide 8*s.* 4*d.* per head.* It is certainly no great burden; but here, again, facts tell us that it is not patiently borne, and that there is a call to have it apportioned equitably as a burden on property.

Opinions will greatly differ as to the best way of meeting these acknowledged difficulties. The shortest and simplest way is to rely on rates—the Government advancing money to build schools, and seeing that they are built, on security of a local rate, and proportioning its annual grants in some way to the sums raised by rate for the maintenance of the schools.† The objections to this scheme, as the normal scheme throughout the country, are that it would almost certainly dry up the stream of voluntary contribution; that it would tend to introduce into the educational system that parsimony and those local jealousies, which are felt so severely in all that concerns our workhouse administration and local sanitary arrangements; that it would very greatly embarrass the settlement of the "religious difficulty;"‡ and that it would not only seriously alienate the clergy, but would be likely to chill the religious ardour in the work, which has done more hitherto than all

---

man is willing to give his parishioners a due share of influence, to consult them in matters of administration, to put their duty plainly before them, to give (if possible) the parents of the children some voice (collectively) in the management—I doubt whether he need be overwhelmed by the burden. Probably to this, as to all other works of good, his contribution will be above the ordinary standard; but is this unreasonable or unjust?

* These figures are taken from the 'Report of the Committee of Privy Council on Education, 1869.'

† This plan was advocated by Canon Girdlestone at the British Association this year; and it would seem to be that adopted by the National Educational League. It is contended that there will be still room for individual liberality.

‡ Some valuable experience on this subject (as on so many others) may be gained by a study of the results of the American system.

other motive influences put together. The objections appear very serious, and they certainly point to a less sweeping plan. It must surely be possible to modify the Procrustean requirements of the Revised Code for the establishment of schools by some reference to the condition of the locality. It cannot be difficult to stimulate still further local contributions in respect of annual maintenance by some Government action; and it would still be possible, and certainly the wisest plan, to keep the power of rating as an *ultima ratio*, if within a given time no schools were created and maintained without it. Such a plan as this is less simple in theory than the "rough and ready" expedient of rating; but it is for that very reason far more likely to be carried and successfully engrafted on our present system.

(*b*) But this is not all. The greatest difficulty, after all, is not in the erection of schoolhouses, nor in the maintenance of good schools, but it is in inducing parents to send their children to school, and to keep them there long enough. Their reluctance arises from various causes, of which some deserve great consideration, others ought not to be even tolerated for a moment. In the latter class we find ignorance or carelessness as to the value of education; local prejudice, which keeps children away "to spite the parson or the squire;" mere slovenliness, which is unable or unwilling to take trouble to secure regularity. No one would hesitate, I think, to sweep away, by any lawful means, such hindrances as these. But the really serious difficulty lies in the fact that the parents, through poverty, absolutely require the children's labour: they might afford the school pence, but they cannot afford to keep their children "idle;" and, accordingly, they carry them off at so early an age, that the knowledge which they have obtained is only superficial, because dependent mainly on memory;* and, therefore, in a few years is all but lost, so

---

* I do not mean that it is not good of its kind, perhaps as good as the age of the learners will allow. My own wonder, after some experience in education, is at the excellence of the results obtained in a good National or British school, considering the smallness of the teaching power. But what is caught by observation, imitation, memory, and quickness—the faculties naturally prominent in childhood—is easily lost. It does not seem to have worked itself into the texture of the mind. I have often known boys of ten years old come from abroad, speaking French or German with ease without ever having learnt it grammatically; in three or four years, unless the knowledge be kept up, they know no more of the language, except as to pronunciation, than those who have never been out of England. Exactly so it is with the child-

that, when they are again drawn to the Night School, they are found almost as ignorant as if they had never been taught. This cause is one which we cannot treat lightly or unfeelingly; it is a cause which ought not to exist, and the true remedies for which lie too deep to be considered here. But still in some way its effects must be met.

It seems to be almost universally acknowledged that the making the schools "free" would not remedy this evil, and would do infinite harm. It is not desirable in the abstract to shift from the parent the duty of providing for his children's teaching, as for his children's bread. But besides this, what is paid for is valued. When a parent pays a school fee, he will take more care that the child attends regularly, and do more to help at home the teaching of the school. Experience seems to establish this point conclusively, both at home and abroad. In the United States the schools are absolutely free; they are, generally speaking, superior to our own; and the poorer classes in America are more keenly alive than ours to the value of education, both in itself and for what it will bring; and yet there the two evils, absenteeism and truancy, are enormous, and the average attendance is decidedly less than that which was found in England in the specimen districts carefully examined.* In Upper Canada, where the schools are nearly free (school fees supplying only about $\frac{1}{18}$ of the whole income), the result is far worse, the average attendance being only 38 per cent. of children on the books, or about one-half the average here.† Our own experience is less conclusive, but I imagine that it points decidedly in the same direction.

---

ren of our Lower Schools: the system allows little personal contact of the mind of the teacher with that of the learner; the age of the learner precludes serious reflection or original thought, — what wonder that knowledge should "lightly come and lightly go"?

* The percentage of average attendance in the ten specimen districts in England was 76 out of every 100 on the books; in five leading States in the Union it was 70 per cent., in eight great cities 58 per cent. The highest English average was 82 per cent.; the highest American average (in Massachusetts) 80 per cent. See Mr. Fraser's Report, pp. 93-95.

† It is right to say, on the other hand, that the proportion of children of school age found on the books is larger than with us, and the school year much longer than in the United States, somewhat longer than with us. In Lower Canada there seems to be a very curious arrangement (see Mr. Fraser's Report, p. 295) by which all children "of school age" *pay fees whether they attend or not.* This stringent measure succeeds in raising half the income by these school fees. But I can find no estimate of the average attendance.

The fact is (as has already been said) that the school pence constitute little or no difficulty. There are few parents who cannot afford them; and these few can easily obtain the means of paying them from public or private sources. What they cannot get is compensation for the loss of the children's labour, for what it earns and for what it saves. What steps must we take to meet this primary difficulty?

Probably very few, even of those who hold the parental authority most sacred, will contend that the State has no right to any interference at all in this matter. A father has duties to his children as well as rights; he is bound to feed and clothe them, and the law punishes him if he does not; he is not allowed to use their labour so as to destroy their health or life, and the law has already interfered to prevent his doing so. I believe that his duties in respect of their minds are as stringent as in respect of their bodies. He is bound to give them the food of the one as much as the food of the other; he has no more right to use their labour, at the expense of their mental development, than at the expense of their bodily health and strength. Nay, it may be plausibly contended, that in the present condition of England, it is a far greater evil to the State that a child should grow up ignorant and brutish than that it should die. Doubtless it is infinitely better that the performance of duty should be left to natural feeling, to moral and religious principle; and in the large majority of cases these are amply sufficient. But the "Law is not made for a righteous man;" its object and its duty is to step in where higher principles fail.

The question, therefore, is not one of right, but of expediency. Indeed, in its main issue, it seems to me almost settled. That the State will interfere I can hardly doubt; the real question is narrowed to that of "direct or indirect compulsion."*

Direct compulsion must mean the summoning every parent to send his children to school, and punishing him if he does not; possibly the institution of "Truancy Officers," after the pattern

---

* In the 'Report of the Educational Committee of Privy Council for 1868–9' it is said "that the inspectors, who refer to the question of compulsory education express themselves, without exception, in favour of it." The speeches of almost every educational meeting are equally decisive in this direction. But the question still remains, What kind of compulsion shall be used?

of the United States, with summary powers to catch and punish absentees or truants. It is at this moment urgently recommended by an active party; but whatever may be the case in the future, it is certain that at the present moment the country is not at all ripe for it; public opinion would not bear it. It is felt, and rightly felt, that it ought to be our last resource; that it is an evil in itself, morally and politically, only to be borne in order to avoid greater evils otherwise inevitable; that, therefore, it ought not to be tried till all other means have failed. Such a law could hardly be carried, and, if carried, it could not, at present at least, be enforced. It is, in fact, a distinctly retrograde step, against the whole course of modern civilisation. It is at variance with all the peculiar traditions and development of our own country. Those who value the old principles of our Constitution, and the vigorous self-reliant freedom which has made England great, will trust that it may never be necessary either to carry or to enforce it.

Once more, the experience of its effect, or rather want of effect, in America is conclusive. The law in Massachusetts is extremely strict in theory. Every parent neglecting (without due cause) to send a child to school is fined 20 dollars; there are truant officers appointed; it is insisted that "compulsory attendance is the proper correlative of free schools." But what is the result? "Public opinion is against it, and it remains almost a dead letter." "In spite of legal enactments and penalties, absenteeism and truancy continue to be the great, and, indeed, the *increasing* evil of American schools."

It is true that the example of Continental nations (Germany and Switzerland especially) is quoted on the other side. In them a compulsory law exists, and public opinion is said to endorse it so thoroughly, that its enforcement by penalties is almost needless. But this example is not nearly so applicable to us as that of America. Our people are not so alive to the value of education as the Germans, nor are they so much used to Government interference with private freedom. In countries, where, for example, a conscription exists, it is but a small thing that children should be "drawn" for school. At present, England will tolerate neither the one institution nor the other. If either is to be ultimately adopted, it must be approached gradually.

There remains, then, what the Rev. Canon Norris, in his interesting and valuable essays,* calls "indirect compulsion."

It is simply the extension of the principle of the 'Factory and Workshop Acts' (a series of Acts ranging from 1833 to 1867). By these Acts, "it may be said generally that no child under the age of 12 or 13 can be employed in any manufacturing process without some kind of schooling." If this principle were extended, so that no "juvenile labour" in any department, agricultural, manufacturing, domestic, or commercial, could legally be used without some certificate of education, the effect would be that no parent could avail himself of the fruits of his children's work until he had given them some needful teaching, until, that is, he had done to them that duty which is incumbent upon him, and which it is, or soon will be, quite possible for him to do. That such indirect compulsion would be supported by public opinion may be argued from the existence and practical fruits of the Acts referred to above. That the parents themselves would soon accept it, perhaps even welcome its compulsion as a help to them against themselves, is, in the opinion of all who have experience on the subject, all but certain. That it would be thoroughly effective in its action on all our respectable poor, there can hardly be a shadow of a doubt.

There remains a class, the idle and vagabond parents, whom this law would not reach, who would deserve and require more direct compulsion. For this Canon Norris suggests the change of two Acts already existing (Mr. Adderley's 'Industrial Schools Act, 1857,' and Mr. Evelyn Denison's 'Out-door Paupers Act, 1857,') from Permissive to Compulsory Acts. "The first Act empowers magistrates to commit to a certified Industrial School all children brought to them as vagrants, or as being 'in no good way.'" The other Act "empowers Guardians to pay for the schooling of the children of out-door paupers out of the rates; and might be amended so as to make their attendance at school a condition of such relief." These Acts as yet have not been enforced as they ought to have been. Magistrates and Guardians have shrunk from the necessary expense which they would entail; and, if it were shown that the local burdens so

---

* 'The Education of the People, our Weak Points and our Strength.' By the Rev. Canon Norris. Simpkin and Marshall, 1869.

entailed would be too heavy, it might be needful to bear some of the expense from the Consolidated Fund. But when we remember the cost of crime and pauperism, when we consider that these neglected children are the nursery not only of crime and pauperism, but of disease, it must be seen that, putting all higher considerations aside, it would be a wise economy to face, for so great a purpose, even a gigantic outlay.

There can be no doubt that by the combination of these means of pressure—the indirect on the independent and respectable classes, the direct on those who have forfeited their places in society and their rights over their children—this great and at present fatal obstacle might be surely and practically overcome.

The conclusion, then, to which we must come is this,—that in the Education of the Poor, more motive power is needed, that in some form the voluntary system of raising and maintaining schools will be modified, that in some form, direct or indirect, education will be enforced.

III. The great question now is this, "Will this alteration necessarily destroy our present system altogether; will it substitute a 'secular' or a 'general' for a 'denominational' scheme?" The question is generally answered in the affirmative; but the more I think over it, the more I believe that it need not be so,—that, under God, it depends on the Church and her clergy, whether it shall be so. Blind Conservatism or blind Revolutionism will destroy the great fabric, so slowly and laboriously reared, so wisely and so deeply founded. But, if we will only recognise existing facts, if we will seek not what is abstractedly our ideal, but what is best for us as we are—then it may go on and prosper for years, perhaps for generations, to come.

Let us clearly consider the three alternatives before us. These are the "Secular System," the "General Religious System," and the "Denominational System."

(*a*) The "Secular System" would exclude all religious teaching, direct or indirect, from the regular instruction given in our Schools. Its advocates are either those who oppose all religious teaching and influence whatever, or those, who, wearied out with the incessant wranglings of our various sects, would in mere despair relegate all religious teaching either to parental instruction and influence at home, or to separate lessons to be given out of

school hours, and in the Sunday School, by clergy or other religious teachers of various denominations. These last do not deny (what indeed to a believer is obvious) that true Education without recognition of religious knowledge, religious obligation, religious devotion, is impossible. But they would confine the province of the school to the giving instruction, and inculcating habits of industry and obedience: they would look to other influences to complete the real education of the child. I believe that the latter class is far more numerous: to its members alone can I appeal in these pages; for where there is no agreement on first principles, argument as to practical developments is futile.

The Secular System has this one recommendation—that it solves our difficulties by cutting the knot which it cannot untie, and that it is accordingly a practicable and intelligible system. But it solves it at a cost, which any religious man must consider to be frightful. In the school it not only tells upon the tone of the scholars by the absence of the constant indirect recognition of religious sanctions and influences; but—what is less often remembered, but, I think, far more important—it tells fatally upon the tone of the teachers. It tends to keep out of the profession those who are its best representatives—men to whom teaching is a work for God, and who will reverence their little ones as being His: it secularises those who have embraced the profession, by keeping their thoughts, words, and acts, continually in a lower and more earthly region. And, since a purely negative position is almost impossible, the system and its administrators, from being "non-religious" become (our very language testifies to the inevitable necessity) "irreligious." The influence of the School will become not neutral, but antagonistic, to the influence of the Church.

The counteracting influences contemplated are obviously insufficient. Those who would relegate all religious teaching to the home can have very little idea of what the homes of our poor really are. Religious influence there may be, and, simple as it is, it will be priceless in its value; but religious teaching there will be little or none. People seem to fancy that, while other teaching requires special gifts and training, religious teaching is a natural and universal gift; which the most ignorant may have and use, if only he be in earnest in using it. There

is a truth, and a vital one, caricatured and perverted in this statement. But what can be more absurd in itself? Of all teaching religious teaching is, and must be, the most difficult. It teaches the highest subjects (the only true "ideas" which the mass of our population can grasp at all):* it needs, above all, that simplicity, which can only be secured by depth and clearness of knowledge: it demands the so-called "tact" (really a much higher quality) which abstains from forcing what must be learnt freely, if learnt to any purpose. Shall we find one parent in fifty among our poorer classes, who is fit to give it? Is there any hope of religious teaching, if it is left to be given at home?

Nor can we be satisfied with the teaching of Religion as an extraneous subject. I pass by the obvious fact that any lesson given out of school stands but a poor chance of attention, and even at the best is regarded as a kind of "extra." I say nothing of the evil of intensifying in the children's minds the sense of religious divisions, and of separating into rival camps those who elsewhere meet as one body. But I think it very clear that the influence of the Religious Teacher will be, especially under these unfavourable circumstances, little indeed in comparison with that of the Secular Teacher, whose presence is constant, and on whose exertions the children's welfare in life depends. If he is (and I have given above the reasons why I think that under this system he is likely to be) irreligious, it is vain to hope generally that his influence will be counteracted, much less that it will be—what it must be for any practical result—overborne.

The Sunday School may undoubtedly do much more in the work of true religious education. But it will be a most unhappy thing, if the whole stress of that work be by necessity laid upon it. People too often forget that for children, as for grown people, Sunday ought to be, really as nominally, a day of rest. The attitude of rest in the mind is (I think) the

---

* Mr. Matthew Arnold, in his Report to the Privy Council for 1868, writes thus:—"The enemies of catechisms have perhaps never considered how a catechism is, for the child in an elementary school, his only contact with metaphysics; it is possible to have too much metaphysics, but some contact with them is to every active mind suggestive and valuable. The Bible is, again, almost his only contact with poetry and philosophy. . . . In English schools" (he continues) "nothing like the use is made of the Bible, simply as an instrument of education, which might be made of it, and is made of it in Germany."

attitude of what may be called "receptiveness," in which impressions are welcomed, emotions kindled, tone and temper affected, but no active mental exertion required. And in learning there is room and need both for "rest" (in this sense) and for work; both for the free reception of religious influence and truth, and the active exertion of memory and of thought. But certainly in the Sunday School the restful attitude of mind should predominate; the peculiar value of the school will be sacrificed, if ever the hard work, without which no knowledge worth having can be gained, is laid as a burden upon it. It may be necessary to make that sacrifice—probably under any secular system it would be so; but we ought not to shut our eyes to the fact that it is a sacrifice, or accept it, unless through an overwhelming necessity.

The conclusions are formed *a priori*; but we are not left to *a priori* inferences only. One of the most valuable parts of Mr. Fraser's report on the Education of the United States is that in which he describes, first, the impression made upon his own mind by the working of their system, and, next, the feeling (a growing feeling it appears) among the Americans themselves on the subject.

Their system is really a "secular system," although the reading of a short portion of the Bible and the use of a simple prayer before school each day, insufficient as it is, yet does something to impress a vague stamp of reverence upon it, and slightly to modify its practical effects. What are its fruits?

Mr. Fraser's conclusion, supported by opinions of many American teachers, is decided, and its decisiveness is enhanced by the tone of moderation and candour which pervades his whole Report. "The intellectual tone is high; the moral tone, though perhaps a little too self-conscious, not unhealthy; but another tone, which can only be vaguely described in words, but of which one feels oneself in the presence, when it is there, and which, for want of a better name, I must call the 'religious' tone, one misses, and misses with regret." He dwells on the inevitable substitution of "the desire to excel, the ambition to be foremost," for the higher motives, which are necessarily banished from the teaching;* and on the tendency to over self-

---

* "The staple of most speeches (by visitors to the scholars) was the well-worn theme of the infinite career which lay before them, and the possibility of every boy who listened to the speaker becoming President of the United States."

assertion (neglect of parental authority and "rowdyism") which is too plainly visible. He protests, indeed, against dark pictures, unwarranted by fact, drawn of the "godlessness" of the system; he reminds us, that "to the discord of Christians, and not to the irreligiousness of educators this, which is considered to be the capital defect of the American system, is due." But he comes back at last to the conclusion that the denominational system, though it be impossible in America, should be maintained still in England, and that to sacrifice it is practically to sacrifice the religious tone of Education.

But, valuable as his own opinion is, still more valuable is his evidence as to the state of opinion on the subject in America. He names, among the elements of danger to the system, the "growing feeling that more distinctly religious teaching is required, and that even the interests of morality are imperfectly attended to," and "the languid way in which its claims to support and sympathy are rested on the higher motives of Christian duty." He states his belief, based on communications both official and private, that "this more, perhaps, than any other adverse influence, seems likely to threaten the permanence and stability of the system." He quotes the report of a Pennsylvanian inspector, which declares "the importance, if not the absolute necessity, of a system of religious training in our public schools," and adds that "the clashing of different religious creeds and the risk of sectarian dissension are far less to be feared than the absence of all religious instruction."

These are significant words. In spite of the infinite diversity of opinion, and the consequent vehemence of sectarianism, the public opinion of America is still strongly religious; and, after experience, it revolts, though at present hopelessly, against the secular system. Our difficulties in this respect, great as they may be, are yet as nothing in respect of theirs. The Church of England, while it is established, has a right to claim, not indeed an exclusive, but a dominant voice on educational matters. And were it otherwise, still public opinion in England (by the confession of believers and unbelievers alike) is at least as strongly religious. It is almost impossible to believe that, except by practical compulsion, it will accept a system which has been tried under the most favourable circumstances and pronounced wanting.

Supposing, indeed, that it should ever do so, most earnestly is it to be hoped that the Clergy and Churchmen generally will not commit the great treason of "despairing of the Republic." If we believe in the power of Christianity, we shall surely conclude that it can overcome greater difficulties than these. No one injures the cause of religious Education more than those who, calling themselves its friends, declare that "education without religion is worse than no education at all," and quote the worn-out saying about "clever devils"—as if all Truth were not from God, as if any influence, which follows His Providential Law by developing the human faculties, could alienate the soul from Him, as if Religion had more to fear from misplaced and perverted intelligence than from the dull, brutal ignorance which is its real alternative. It might have been hoped that Tennyson's 'Northern Farmer' would have given us at least some inkling of the truth. It might have been thought that any attentive study of the actual course of God's Providence in the Education of the World for the Gospel would have put to shame such terror of secular instruction. Should the "secular system" ever be established, it will still be our own fault, if we allow it to occupy the whole ground. We must show that it cannot be the whole of Education, and strive to supply the influences which are wanting—by extra lessons, by Sunday Schools, by Bible Classes, by special care in the instruction of those who seek Confirmation—by any way and every way which God's Providence opens to us. We shall (I trust) not do—what it appears too many of the clergy and other ministers of religion do under a practically secular system in Upper Canada—hold aloof, and leave it in all its defectiveness and perversion, contenting ourselves with the easy task of continual protests and prophecies of evil.

But still we must regard its establishment as an evil against which we should strive, and, in order to prevent it, do our best to maintain, by needful elasticity and modification, the practically religious system which we possess. I believe that we may do so now; and that if we lose this opportunity, we shall incur a very heavy responsibility.

(*b*) The next system to be considered is that of the General or "Unsectarian" Scheme of Education, which is intended to secure the inestimable advantages of religious tone, and (in less

degree) of religious teaching, without introducing any of those controverted points, on which Christians are in disagreement with each other. No one can doubt that, in theory, this scheme is far better than any which has to recognise and even stereotype religious differences, or to ignore the element of religious Education altogether. No one ought to put forward without much regret and some shame any considerations which tend to point out its impracticability. The picture drawn (as for instance by the Rev. W. L. Clay in his Essay on Education, in the 'Essays on Church Policy') of a school in which all shall be taught Christianity by simply "learning Christ"—and, as the righteous man keeps the Law without feeling its distinct enactments, grow into true Christian doctrine without dogmatic teaching—is a beautiful one; and, if we are forced to regard it as an ideal only, we cannot but grieve over the actual conditions of life, which remove it to the ideal region.

But it may be asked, it is asked, either regretfully or scornfully,—"Is Christianity, then, as a general term, a mere nonentity? Are Christians so divided among themselves, that there shall be no common basis, hardly any common element, in their simple teaching of childhood?" But here is one of the commonest fallacies possible. There is (thank God!) still a vast amount, which is common to all Christian systems: there is (we trust) still an unity, marred though it be and to the outward eye even destroyed, between all who worship the same Saviour, and hope to meet in the same heaven hereafter. But it does not follow that this common element can be torn from its context in each system, and reproduced as a kind of general residuum, unattached to any special characteristics. There is a common type of humanity in the European and the Patagonian, in the Eskimo and the Negro; but who can figure to himself *in rerum naturâ* the ideal man, free from all national or local peculiarities? If Professor Owen is to be believed, there is an unity of type in all vertebrate animals; but can any one, without creating a monstrosity, bring out this ideal mammal, so as to represent it either to the eye or to the imagination? So in all forms of Christian teaching (excepting the extremer forms of Unitarianism) there may be an underlying unity; but yet men have never yet succeeded,—it is easy to point out by the process of exhaustion how little hope there is that they will

succeed—in drawing it out from the living systems of which it is the heart, without destroying it and them in the process. In proportion as each system has the life of faith, in proportion as its parts are welded together into an energetic unity, the attempt becomes more and more hopeless. Where Mr. Clay's ideal is realised (and in many schools to no small degree it is realised), the result is obtained not by discarding dogma, but by using it as a means, and only as a means, of bringing out vital truth; not by banishing every point on which there has been difference of opinion, but by preserving the due "proportion of faith," and so bringing out, prominently though not exclusively, the fundamental verities of almost universal acceptance.

We must remember that on this system, *Melior est conditio prohibentis*, and that one single objector may keep from the teaching of the school, and therefore from the education of the majority, elements of the greatest importance, if they do not chance to be included in his Creed. We are reminded of the old story of the painter, who exposed his picture, with the request that each passer-by would mark any point which seemed to him defective; and found that, while all expressed genuine admiration of the picture as a whole, every square inch of his canvas was scored through and through. I fear, that even if Christians alone are to be considered, our Creed will be not unlike his picture. But it must be remembered that those who are not Christians have an equal right to consideration under our scheme; and if the most general and unsectarian scheme be devised, still some must be left out, under the protection of a Conscience Clause, and the imposing unity of the system will be marred by this necessity.

I cannot but fear that this system, when it was put to the test of experience, would gradually evaporate all the living energy of religious teaching and fade away, perhaps slowly, perhaps rapidly, but in either case surely, into mere secularity. If it is answered that there are many good and even excellent schools under the "British and Foreign School Society," conducted on this general system, we gladly acknowledge this; but we must point out that they exist under the shadow of a great denominational system,* and it is well known that they

---

* Of inspected schools the Church-of-England schools number 943,458 children present at examination, Roman Catholic schools, 79,272. All other

do not generally touch the poorest classes, for whom all education is practically confined to the school. In these schools there seems to be great diversity of practice, according to the influence which predominates in them. In some schools the Scriptures are not only read but taught, with exposition tolerably free and more or less dogmatic. In others there is nothing whatever but the bare reading of the letter of the Bible, which even to an ordinary meeting of adults is painfully insufficient, but, as a religious instruction to children, is the merest of pretences. The system, then, is conducted on too small a scale; it involves too many internal differences and contradictions in practice; it is too much influenced by the greater system without, to furnish a fair criterion on this subject, and to claim to have solved the "religious difficulty."

We must take a more crucial test, conducted on a larger scale and with fewer interferences. And here, once more, the experience of our Transatlantic brethren, both in the United States and in Upper Canada, is only too decisive.

The schools in the United States have, as has been already said, eventually fallen into the secular system. But this was far from the intention of the original founders of National Education in 1642. They provided expressly that "religious instruction should be given to all children," and doubtless in the early days of Massachusetts it was given on a system definite and rigid enough. But though this Act may never have been actually repealed, yet the addition made to it, that such religious instruction shall not "favour the tenets of any particular sect of Christians," or (as in the city of New York) that "the religious doctrines or tenets of any particular Christian or other religious sect shall not be taught, inculcated, or practised," has reduced it to a nonentity. The effect is that the reading of an isolated passage of Scripture "*without note or comment*," and the use of a general prayer at the opening of school, are all that is left in ordinary use—some schools venturing to rise above this level, and give "moral instruction" from the Scriptures; others sinking below it, and apparently neglecting even to read the Bible at all. It is considered a matter for special notice that in

---

schools put together (many being denominational) only number 262,048 children. If all schools, inspected and uninspected, were taken, the proportion of Church schools would be far larger.

many schools of Pennsylvania the "Lord's Prayer and Apostles' Creed are frequently and devoutly recited in concert by the pupils." But it is probable that an objector might stop even this, which is clearly the outcome of some unusual religious zeal in the teacher. No one can doubt that the system is now all but purely secular; few will wonder that it has become so, when they consider the circumstances of the case.

But a more recent experiment of the same kind has been tried in Upper Canada. In the Minute of October 3rd, 1850, we read, "As Christianity is the basis of our whole system of elementary education, that principle should pervade it throughout;" we find it provided that (under the protection of a "Conscience Clause") "pupils shall be allowed to receive such religious instruction as their parents or guardians desire, according to any general regulations provided for the government of Common Schools." In 1855 it is ordered that schools shall open and close with "reading a portion of Scripture and prayer" (two forms chiefly taken from our Prayer-Book being recommended); that the Lord's Prayer shall be used, and the Ten Commandments taught. It is added that clergy of various persuasions, or their authorised representatives, shall have a right to instruct the pupils of their own persuasion, "at least once a week, after four o'clock in the afternoon,* in the school-house."

No one who reads these provisions will doubt that they embody a sincere *bonâ fide* attempt to realise "general and unsectarian religious education." But what is the result? Mr. Fraser quotes the Chief Superintendent's Report for 1863, containing extracts from reports of 152 out of 341 local superintendents:—"Many of them do not notice the subject at all; those that do notice it, do not paint a cheerful picture." In a note he quotes all the reports which notice the subject, and the result shows that his expression is at least not too strong—"It is evident to me" (he continues) that "what is understood as religious instruction in most cases is nothing more than the 'exercise' (as it is called) of reading a portion of Scripture at the opening of the school, and that the great obstacle to any-

---

* I leave any who know the appearance of a school "after four o'clock in the afternoon" to judge how popular such instruction would be, and how much freshness and vigour of mind will be brought to it by the children.

thing more definite being attempted is the existence of sectarian jealousies and the resolution of people to regard rather the points in which they differ than those in which they agree" (p. 252). The result (that is) is substantially the same as in the United States. I do not think it one which those who care for religious education will be willing to accept.

It is somewhat difficult, as yet, to obtain any authoritative statement of the results of the Irish "Mixed System." For this we must wait till the Report of the Commission on Primary Education in Ireland comes out. But there is little doubt that the system has to a great extent broken down, and that one of the two extreme alternatives—the denominational or secular system—will have to take the place of the mean, which hitherto the State has sought to maintain. The conditions of the problem in this case are materially different from those of the two former cases, but the conclusion is practically the same. We may regret, but it is useless to ignore, the significance of the recurrence of this result.

It is, of course, easy enough to go off here into lamentation over, or denunciation of, the temper of sectarianism, and to refer it all (as it is popularly but most untruly referred) to the baneful influence of the clergy.* But this will not conduce to much practical result; our concern is unhappily with facts. Painful they may be; but when, as at the present moment, the advocates of an unsectarian religious education are invited (by the National League) to co-operate in the introduction of a new system, it is necessary to bring these facts out, and even to urge them on the consideration of the many earnest and religious men who may be inclined to accept the invitation. It sounds almost paradoxical to say (what, nevertheless, is really true) that this system would work well only when there was no strong temper of sectarian bitterness abroad, when (that is)

---

* I am sorry to see that even Canon Kingsley (if he be correctly reported) seems to confuse "denominational education" with "education in the hands of the clergy." That the clergy will always, under any system, be more interested than any other body in the education of the poor I doubt not; but the question whether religious education is or is not to be, and under what conditions it can be secured, is hardly a question for the clergy alone. And, whatever popular opinion may say on this subject against our much-abused order, no one, who has experience of facts, will doubt that the clergy are (as they ought to be) at least as tolerant, at least as capable of large and liberal views, as the religious laity.

the evil which it is especially proposed to meet had ceased to exist.

(*c*) There remains the third alternative, the maintenance, with modification, of the present system. It is generally, but not correctly, called the "denominational system," for its principle is (see Revised Code, p. 3) to aid schools denominational or undenominational, provided that in the latter "the Scriptures are read from the Authorised Version."

It has an enormous advantage in the fact that it *is* the present system. It must be, I think, considered that the public faith is in great degree pledged to it—so far pledged that it is hard to conceive how, unless our rulers find either gross failure or neglect of the imposed conditions in the existing schools, there can be any moral right to destroy the system suddenly, or starve it out gradually. When the Education Committee of Privy Council was formed thirty years ago, we must conceive that the representatives of the State surveyed carefully the whole question of education, and considered whether they would take the whole burden and assume the whole government of the education of the country, after the Continental and Transatlantic practice, or whether, believing in the power of individual effort, and especially in the power of religious zeal and charity, and knowing that to make the system a State system must dry up the one power and cripple the other, they would follow the line which in all matters of national enterprise English Governments have followed, viz., leave free scope to the voluntary and spiritual agencies, and assume only directive and inspective functions. They deliberately chose the latter alternative, and, on the faith of that choice, the individual energy appealed to has given a noble response—a response the value of which is not to be measured merely by the money lavishly given, but by the moral elements of self-denial, charity, sympathy, and unceasing work, which it involved.

Now, it is impossible to consider that such pledges of faith are irrevocable; if they were, no abuse could be removed and no mistake corrected. If, therefore, the present system had broken down—had proved to be impracticable, had inflicted any considerable hardships—there might have been ground for sweeping all these considerations aside, and sacrificing individual claims to the imperious call of public duty and interest. But a

short consideration of the facts referred to above will prove that it is not so; the work done already is a noble work, and its defects are chiefly negative; the interests involved in it are many and varied; the enthusiasm which originally gave it life glows and even increases, in spite of no small discouragements. It is not a dead but a living thing; if we are to get rid of it, it must be not by burial but by slaughter.

It is, of course, perfectly clear that the system must accord with the facts of the case; it must recognise religious diversity, it must provide for religious liberty. It is now fortunately almost needless, as the experience of the Liverpool Congress shewed, to argue for the necessity of a "Conscience Clause,"[*] such as may secure perfect liberty alike to the teacher and the taught. It is only unfortunate that the Committee of Privy Council should have had so little patience with the scruples of the clergy, to whom they confess that their cause owes so much; it is still more unfortunate that we clergy should have had to concede reluctantly what we ought to have accepted willingly—what we ought, looking, not to abstract theory, but to the actual circumstances of the religious state of England, to have welcomed gladly as an evidence of religious earnestness.

But it may be well to point out that the Concience Clause has grown up, as most of our institutions have grown up, in order to represent and perfect an already existing state of things; it is like a statute which is declaratory of Common Law. In most Church Schools as we know, in Dissenting Schools as we cannot doubt, it has been the practice (and that practice must root itself deeper every day) to respect religious scruples

---

[*] I can see no objection to that of the Endowed Schools Bill "that the parent or guardian of any scholar attending school as a day-scholar, may claim, by notice in writing addressed to the principal teacher of such school, the exemption of such scholar from attending prayer or religious worship, or from any lesson or series of lessons on a religious subject, and that such scholar shall be exempted accordingly, and shall not by reason of such exemption be deprived of any advantage or emolument." "If any teacher in ordinary lessons teaches systematically and persistently any particular religious doctrine for the teaching of which exemption has been claimed, the governing body shall, on complaint made in writing by the parent or guardian of such scholar, hear the complainant, inquire into the circumstances, and, if the complaint be judged to be reasonable, make all proper provisions for remedying the matter complained of" (Sect. 15). If similar exemption is claimed for a boarder, and declined by those in charge of the boarding-houses, then provision shall be made that the scholar shall without loss of privilege attend as a day-scholar (Sect. 16).

of parents, and to refuse to force Church formularies upon the children of those Dissenters who object to them. The managers of these schools, by the very maintenance of their own system, assert the importance of definite religious faith, and, though human nature is inconsistent enough on such subjects, they have begun to feel that they must recognise, and that they ought even to welcome and to respect, those scruples which were the assertion of it in others. It must be remembered, and it is very important to remember it, as explaining the past and indicating the probable future, that not all Dissenters, nor even the majority of them, would object to the simple Church teaching of our schools, if only they felt security that they would not be made, as some hotheaded and intolerant men would like to make them, centres of religious proselytism. It has not followed, and it would not follow, that the existence of a Conscience Clause must imply its frequent or universal application. It may, indeed, be said that in most cases its imposition is needless, because there is a substantial application of its principle already. But those who use this argument seem to forget that all law is made for those who do not respect moral obligations, and that it is not sufficient to enjoy on sufferance what may fairly be claimed as a right. The time of transition and growth on this matter is over. For good or for evil, the position of the Church has altered, from the identity with the State which was our old English ideal, to the exclusive recognition of it by the State as a distinct body; from this exclusive recognition to a recognition, primary still but not exclusive, by the side of which other forms of religious belief emerge into power and State patronage. The alteration is due to the great unhappy fact, not of religious diversity, but of religious separation; the process must go on further still, unless the Church strengthens her hold on her people, and represents more fully the religious faith and life of England. And the "Conscience Clause" does nothing but acknowledge the fact; the time is come, when, however regretfully, that acknowledgment must be made formal and complete.

Let this be done, and the present system, enlarged and supplemented, seems to offer advantages which no other scheme can ever hope to secure.

It is hardly needful to point out its indisputable economy, in comparison with any system which can possibly supersede it. At present, speaking generally, about one-third of the whole expense is borne by the public from the Consolidated Fund, one-third by voluntary contributions, one-third by the parents themselves in school-pence. I allow that economy is not the primary question: if we could believe that the second and third sources of support were undesirable in themselves, the nation ought not to refuse to make a sacrifice, even though our heavy public burdens were greatly increased. But the fact of voluntary contribution is an actual moral benefit, bringing out mutual duty and sympathy between classes; the contribution by the parents is still more valuable, representing as it does the sense of parental responsibility and the security for parental interest in the children's progress. It does seem, therefore, all but madness to throw away these two great means of support, full of moral as well as material fruitfulness, and lay the whole burden—a burden which must in any case greatly increase as education is improved—on the overtaxed resources of the country. But this view may be left to the common sense of our men of business. I proceed to speak of advantages, less obvious but even more important.

It may be taken for granted that it will, to a great extent, perpetuate the religious element in the education of the country. It will, of course, give to religious instruction the place of honour, from which no one, who considers even its enormous intellectual superiority to all the other instruction of our Lower Schools, could wish to dethrone it. All that is needed is to remember that it is the quality, rather than the quantity, of such instruction which constitutes its value; that we ought to guard against even the semblance of excuse for the statement of the mob-orators that our children are "crammed with catechisms and Jewish pedigrees;" that we ought to shew, what I am sure we may shew, that children whose minds have been kindled and elevated intellectually by the great ideas which the simplest Bible lesson brings home to them, can outstrip in the race of secular knowledge those whose whole attention is given to it. In such instruction the clergy should take their part; all serious-minded schoolmasters will desire it, and wel-

come their presence and direction;* but it will be a fatal error if they engross it, robbing the teacher of the highest part of his teaching, and in the children's minds dissociating the religious element from general instruction, and making it a kind of professional teaching of the "parson." But, whoever gives the lesson, it should be specialised in tone and spirit; two such lessons a week will do more than the wearisome iteration every day of the mere reading lesson, which degrades the Bible to the level of a grammar or a geography book.

Nor can we doubt that our religious teaching must be mainly Scriptural, and, except for the merest outline, the more we get rid of "Manuals" and Summaries of Scripture History, and go to the Bible itself, the better it will be for our children. If it were necessary, it would be easy to use no other book. But then free explanation and enforcement must be permitted; for nothing can be more absurd than the idea that any material good comes from the simple reading of the letter of Holy Writ, without the power of explaining it, and bringing, through the mind of the religious teacher, the mind of the Spirit into close living contact with the minds of the little ones. Give us a really "open" Bible, and no Church-of-England man can believe that anything else is "necessary to salvation."

But, on the other hand, the depreciation of the Catechism seems in the highest degree unphilosophical and even absurd. If it be crammed, as, I fear, it too often is, as, in fact, the experience of every Inspector proves it to be,† it is, of course, worse than useless. All "cram" is, by the very force of terms, unwholesome. Nor should it be forgotten that the language of the Catechism is in parts technical, and that all technical terms are the hardest at first and the easiest at last—the hardest till they are explained, the easiest when explanation has been grasped, and it is seen that in the short limits of the technical word the whole explanation is gathered

---

[*] At the late Conference of the London Church Schoolmasters' Association this wish was strongly expressed. Possibly the London clergy may, from the great pressure upon them, be less regular and active in this respect than the country clergy.

[†] I saw the other day a notice by a Diocesan Inspector, of the answer "My godfathers and godmothers did promise and *devour* three things in my name." No one can tell, without careful cross-questioning, how little meaning children attach to words learnt by heart, or how often they attach a modern conventional sense to an old word.

up and crystallized into a systematic form. Of no words is the old saying so true, as of technical words, that "they are the counters of wise men and the money of fools." But if the language be difficult, the idea of the Catechism is the simplest possible; it grows out of the actual condition of the child (the opening "What is your name?" has a wonderful individualising value); it unfolds out of the actual Covenant to which he looks for salvation, the Creed, the Law, the Grace of Christian life. Like all things really simple, it goes deep enough into the truth to be always growing in fruitfulness, as the powers of intelligence and faith increase. But at every point it is, if rightly explained and understood, at once the needful and sufficient "doctrine of a Christian man" or Christian child. To neglect it is simply to waste the whole teaching and experience of Christian antiquity, and to make each child a spiritual unit instead of being a member of Christ's Church.

But religious instruction is not all. There is—it is a mere commonplace to repeat it—a religious tone, arising partly from the superior power of moral training, partly from the reverence and seriousness, from the union of moral superiority with sympathy, which are given out insensibly by the Christian Faith of the Teacher. It is absurd to suppose that for the mass of mankind there can be efficient moral training without religion. No morality except that which is religious can be at once universal and individual, firmly based on principles and yet elastic and hearty in its details. It is just possible that such training may be given, where the teacher is precluded from any distinctive tenets, afraid at every point lest, in pouring out his own heart, he should be trenching on forbidden ground. But the influence which is not formally didactic, either in the intellectual or moral sphere, but which is diffused by the very presence of Christian Faith, from heart to heart rather than from mind to mind or conscience to conscience—this, it is hard, almost impossible, to preserve in a system where all distinctive religious views are proscribed. It is acknowledged on all hands, that imagination and feeling are stirred by details, by the individual embodiments of universal principles, by the actual developments of general Truths through special experiences; but in these the forbidden frontier will always be crossed, and the Teacher bidden by unsectarian school-managers to keep his

ADDITIONAL NOTE TO ESSAY IX. ON THE CHURCH AND EDUCATION.

THESE pages were written little more than six months ago; but, during that time, the swift march of events has changed the practical bearings of the whole subject, and made some speculations and arguments almost obsolete. The question has been thoroughly discussed by the Education League on one side and the Education Union on the other; and it has occupied in a very special manner the attention of all thinking men. Finally, the Education Bill of 1870 has been brought forward by Her Majesty's Government; and although it is at this moment before the House of Commons, and is not likely to emerge from it without severe criticism and protracted discussion, yet there is little doubt that in its main features it will be carried.

The Bill itself fulfils the hope expressed in the first pages of this Essay; it is a comprehensive and decided measure, and within two or three years it must produce at least an approximation towards a complete system of National Education. Without any attempt at compromise, the scheme, as it originally stood, mediated not unfairly between the rival schemes, and represented pretty accurately the public opinion of the country. Even now, although the changes made are difficult to defend theoretically, and are likely to introduce a good deal of practical difficulty, it is an honest, able, and useful measure.

In the first place it refuses utterly to destroy or undermine the existing schools. It enforces a Conscience Clause, and takes away denominational and religious inspection; otherwise it leaves them as they are, and even proposes to correct the short-sighted policy of the Revised Code, by aiding them on a more liberal scale.

In the second place, while providing for all exceptional cases of hardship, its framers have been bold enough to resist the cry for "Free Schools," and so to recognise the duty and responsibility of parents towards their children.

Next, it provides for rate-supported Schools, where School accommodation is deficient, by the failure of the present system, and insists that no schools shall be recognised which are not in some way inspected. The step is an important one, pregnant with results; but it is one absolutely necessary—one from which the Government could not have shrunk without serious dereliction of duty.

In respect of compulsion, it proceeds tentatively and partially. It leaves it to School boards where formed (and except in neglected

districts they are not to be formed), to exercise direct compulsion, if they will. This provision I deeply regret; nothing which has transpired has shaken my opinion that indirect compulsion properly applied would be far better in principle and far more effective in practice; and even regarding this clause as an experiment, I doubt whether it is not too partial to be a satisfactory one. In direct compulsion we play our last card, and it should be played very carefully and decisively.

The great struggle, of course, has been over the "religious difficulty." Two things have been made clear: first, that the English people will not have a purely secular system; next, that they will not be put off with "the Bible without note or comment" as a means of effective religious instruction. The Bill, as it originally stood, assumed these two points, and then proceeded to solve the difficulty in the only defensible and practicable manner, by putting School Boards in the position of ordinary School managers, and suffering them to determine in each locality the character of their rate-supported Schools (denominational, undenominational, or secular), according to the necessities of the case. No other proposal accords thoroughly with the religious diversity of the country, and preserves an attitude of rigid impartiality for the State. Yet in deference more to clamour than to argument, this provision has been so far modified, that no "catechism or distinctive religious formulary" is to be taught in rate-supported Schools. The concession may stave off immediate difficulties, but it is defective in principle, and (I fear) liable to much difficulty and secularist encroachment in the future. I cannot but doubt its wisdom, especially as the Government might easily have carried their Bill without it.

These changes are (I think) unfortunate in what they effect, and dangerous in what they imply. But still the Bill is a wise and moderate one; it is greatly to be desired that it should be carried; and, if it be, the country will be able to point to the year 1870 as one which did the best service that has yet been done to the cause of National Education, and, therefore, to the cause of National happiness and advancement. The Church has acted in a moderate and conciliatory spirit, even when her forbearance has been sorely tried. She cannot disguise from herself the fact that the educational changes will introduce her to new competition and new difficulties, and that they imply another step in the direction of pure religious equality; but, if she relies on her own intrinsic strength, she will have no reason to regret her present moderation, or to fear the future trial.

A. B.

ESSAY X.

THE CHURCH AND THE PEOPLE.

By WILLIAM DALRYMPLE MACLAGAN, M.A.,
Rector of Newington, Surrey.

CONTENTS OF ESSAY X.

- The alienation of the working-classes from the Church. Why is this? What can be done to remedy it?
- The excuses alleged by the working-classes themselves considered. Various other causes.
- How far is the Church to blame? No welcome to the poor in many of our churches. Usual mode of conducting service unsuitable and unattractive.
- What can be done? The work not hopeless.
- The Laity must do their part: the Clergy must welcome their help. Parochial Unions; Guilds and Brotherhoods.
- Increase of the Episcopate.
- The work of the Parish Priest in connection with the Services of the Church.
- One great principle: to win souls, not to fill a church.
- The masses to be reached by missionary agency:
  - Lay-agency requisite to carry this out effectually.
  - "The Parochial Mission" described.
  - Preparation needed before it is commenced.
  - The mode of conducting it—
    - In the church: Special Services; Sermons; Instruction Class; Bible Class.
    - Out of the church: After-Meetings in schoolroom, or elsewhere; Extemporaneous Prayer; Personal Dealing with individuals.
    - Open-air-preaching: what kind effectual, and where.
    - How to treat Non-conformist efforts in the same work: neither oppose nor hinder.
- How to make Church Services more profitable.
  - The Pew-system: its faults not remediable by unqualified Free-and-open system.
  - Ritual: room for variety in details; general need for more brightness and heartiness.
  - Sermons: must be pointed rather than eloquent: earnestness above oratory: more teaching, less preaching.
  - Exposition of God's Word in the church as distinct from set sermons.
  - Explanation of the Meaning of the Prayers.
  - Close and hearty adherence to the Church's system: Seasons; Festivals: frequent Communions; daily Prayers; churches open for private Prayer.
- Importance of nurturing the spiritual life of our godly people.
- Meditations and united prayer.
- Hopeful view of the Church's work.
- Conclusion.

THE CHURCH AND THE PEOPLE.

It is often said that the Church has lost its hold upon the people, and especially in our large towns. If by this we mean that there are a great many persons, and especially in the humbler classes of society, who never go to church; and that this is peculiarly the case in our large towns, we fear that the assertion cannot well be gainsaid. But if it is meant that this is true of the Church of England more than of the Dissenting bodies, we must pause before assenting to such a statement. For the fact is that the multitude of persons that absent themselves from Church are not found in the Chapel. They go nowhere. Whatever dependence may be placed upon an estimate, which is often quoted, that only two per cent. of working men are found either in church or chapel, it evidently applies in no special degree to the Church. The real meaning of such a statement is this, that religion has lost its hold upon the masses of the people. How far the Church may have been indirectly to blame in this matter we shall presently inquire, but meantime let us concern ourselves simply with the fact, that the people in England are less religious than once they were; that at least they are less observant of the public duties of religion; and in such a case we cannot doubt that its private duties share in this neglect. Whatever one may believe as to the existence here and there of men, or more rarely women, who, while they forsake the assembling of themselves together, are yet diligent in private devotion, and in the study of God's Word, there is no one who seriously believes this to be the case with the mass of persons of whom we are now speaking. It is seldom that they even profess to pay any regard to the duties of religion, if once they have abandoned the public worship of God. It is among the more educated or more prosperous of the people that we find the man who says, "I can read my Bible and say my prayers at home."

But the masses of our labouring men indulge in no such sophistries. They don't go to church because they don't care to go, and they have little more to say about it.

What has brought about this state of things? What causes are tending to perpetuate it now? Above all, what can be done by way of remedy? These are the inquiries to which we propose to address ourselves in this Essay. But we will chiefly concern ourselves with the last. Our aim is to be practical rather than philosophical; our chief desire is to suggest some means by which the teaching of the Church may be brought home to the people, and the people brought back to the Church. But with a view to this we must first consider shortly some of the causes to which we may fairly attribute the present state of things.

Let us begin by asking the people themselves. Among the poorest classes there are two excuses commonly pleaded in apology for their neglect of the Church and its services. First, they need the Sunday as a day of bodily rest; they have no other; they are tired out with their week of toil; they must lie in bed, or at least stop at home, or, perhaps, breathe the fresh air in the parks or fields; but they are too tired to go to church; they have no heart for it, and they do not go. We must all have heard excuses such as these, and most of us must have felt that it is not easy to answer them. But why should there be this excessive toil?

The covetousness of our age has much to do with this condition of the labouring poor. The greediness of gain, the eager struggle in the race for riches, the passion for wealth, which now, more than perhaps at any former time, are the ruling principles in the world of trade and commerce—it is to these we must look, in no little degree, as the causes of the prolonged and unceasing labour, which are exacted from both working men and women, who, for the most part, have no choice but either to work like this or not to work at all. There are, thank God, a certain number, and we trust an increasing number, of men engaged in trade and commerce as employers of labour, who are doing something to relieve the burden of their servants and to give them some little portion at least of the primeval day of rest; a few less hours of labour on the Saturday; or perhaps, though much more rarely, an hour or two

of freedom in the evening of every summer day. But even these alleviations of the life of toil have scarcely reached the poorest classes of our labouring people; and until they can have some rest on other days, we cannot wonder—however much we may grieve—if on the day which was intended to bring rest alike to soul and body, the claims of the body alone should be considered to the neglect of the necessities of the soul.

But there is another plea which is almost more familiar to us on the lips of the labouring poor. They have no good clothes—nothing fit to go to church in—and they are ashamed to be seen. When we think of the gorgeous apparel which glides along the aisles of many of our churches, and sinks to rest in softly-cushioned pews, can we wonder that ill-clad men and women should come to think that "the church is no place for the like of them"? Can we be surprised that they should prefer to idle away the day of rest in their own miserable homes, or to seek for society less glaringly unlike themselves, in the too hospitable parlour or the unpretending benches of the public-house? It is easy for us to say that they ought not to be ashamed of their clothing, however poor it may be, when they are coming to the House of God. But if the poor ought not to be ashamed to come in all their poverty of clothing among the rich, ought not the rich to be ashamed thus to flaunt their finery in the faces of the poor? Is it too much to hope that, among the multitude of women professing godliness in this Christian country, a faithful band may one day be found, moved alike by reverence for their Lord and by love for His poor, who will have grace from Him and boldness in His Spirit to face the critical remarks of the fashionable world, and to show by the plainness and simplicity of their dress, at least in the House of God, that they have learned to prefer the ornament of a meek and quiet spirit to the pomps and vanities of this wicked world?

But after making every allowance for the influence of those causes which we have already considered, in alienating the poor from the services of the sanctuary, we must not forget that there have been other causes at work, which have more or less tended to the same unhappy end. To one of these we have already alluded, but must for a moment

return. The public house is, in many instances, the chief and most successful rival of the House of God. Not only on Sunday does its open door too often attract the feet which might otherwise have found their way to the place of worship; but the unbounded facilities which day and night are placed within the reach of the people, the temptations which are presented to them to indulge in drink, and thus to degrade not only their temporal condition but also their whole moral and spiritual nature;—what Parish Priest has not groaned in spirit at the havoc which these things make among his flock, and the tremendous power which they exert for evil over the people whom he longs to see within the walls of his church, but for whom he longs in vain? This is not the place to discuss the measures which have been proposed to remove or to mitigate this evil. Many of them have been sufficiently preposterous, at once unnatural and impracticable. But of the evil itself there can be no doubt, nor can it be hopeless to provide a remedy. But meantime the fact is indisputable that among the influences which are at work, directly and indirectly, to keep back the people from the church, the unsatisfactory arrangements of what is called the liquor traffic are really among the most important. So long as at almost every corner of every street the public house presents its temptations to the passer by; so long as the liberty of the subject is supposed to include the liberty of any man to drink himself to death while his wife and children starve; so long will the Church be left to grieve over thousands of her children who, through the slavery of drink, forsake the service of God.

But now, in connection with this part of our subject, we come to the question—"How far has the Church herself been to blame?" And we fear we must answer—"Much every way." It would be a hopeless, and for our present purpose a needless, task to trace back to its origin the wide-spread apathy which had paralyzed the Church a hundred years ago. Its traces have not yet altogether disappeared. Its fruits may be found for many years to come. Any man of even middle age, looking back upon his early years, may remember enough of what was common then to make him thank God that better days have dawned upon the Church. But can we wonder that in these long years of deadness the people should have gradually lost

their care for spiritual things, or else have renounced their allegiance to a Church which had cared so little for their souls? And then, when times of commercial prosperity and the development of trade and of locomotion had drawn the people more and more to the great centres of commerce and manufacture, and the population gathering and increasing had far outgrown the provision for their spiritual need, it is easy to see how the artisan and the labourer fresh from the country village where, at least, they might find room, and often sought it, in the House of God, should gradually lose the habit of worship and devotion where there was neither place for them to worship nor pastor to lead them in the ways of God. It is in a great degree to this one cause that we owe the present habits of the poorer class in our large cities, as regards the services of the Church. It has become the custom not only of the individual but of the class to which he belongs, to neglect habitually the public worship of God. And we must never forget this in considering the causes which have alienated the poor so much more than the rich from the House of Prayer. In the upper and middle classes of society it is the fashion to go to church; it is looked upon as respectable. Among these classes public opinion is in favour of Church-going; not perhaps of religion—certainly not in favour of a high standard of religious life—but at least of occasional attendance at the services of the Church. With the poor it is exactly the reverse. Among them the marked men are those who go to church—not those who stay away; and the moral courage which is required in any man among the poorer class, when he becomes a church-goer, is not the least among the difficulties which stand in the way of the people in connection with their attendance on the services of the Church. But for this state of things the Church is, in a great degree, answerable. Had there been zeal enough in the Church to provide the means of grace and the ministrations of the Church for our growing population, they would not have been driven to the formation of those habits of neglect the uprooting of which is proverbially so difficult. Noble efforts are now being made in London and elsewhere to undo the effects of past mistakes, but it will be long before they can make any permanent impression. It is like baling out the water from a rocky basin while the tide is flowing and filling it as fast as we empty. Once it

would have been enough to build churches, and the people would have used them; now they must be taught to care for the services of the Church before they will take their place even when it is provided for them.

But there is another cause which in an almost equal degree has drawn the poor away from the Church. The churches which were built in past times, and even too many of those which are built in our own day, are not built for the people. They are built for the few, not for the many; for the rich, not for the poor. When we think of the aspect of an average London church as it existed about twenty years ago, or as it still may be seen in by no means the most obscure portions of the great metropolis; the cushioned pews with their exclusive occupants; the stately beadle warning off the *profanum vulgus;* the discriminating pew-opener inwardly calculating with an accuracy acquired by long experience the probabilities of a sixpence being ready in the hand; and then, worse than all, the open benches ranged along the centre passage, or stowed away in the furthest corners of the church as free seats reserved for the use of the poor; when we think of this, and then imagine ourselves in the position of an honest labouring man or thriving mechanic living in some of the courts or narrow streets which hem in the wealthy neighbourhood—can we, any of us, in our conscience say that we should have liked to go to church under such circumstances? can any of us really feel surprised that the poor should have stayed away? And when we further remember that the service too often was about as lively and reverent as the proceedings in the Court of Chancery, and about as little "understanded of the people," have we far to seek for the reason which made the said people conspicuous by their absence, which kept them resting idle in their little homes, or led them to the open parks and fields, or even beguiled the more unstable among them to the social pleasures and sensual excitements of the beershop and the tavern?

We do not forget that there have been other influences at work, of a more subtle kind, all tending to aggravate the evil which we deplore. The wide-spread diffusion of cheap literature of a sceptical and immoral character; the growing interest of the people in social and political questions, as well as in matters of a scientific kind, an interest which can only be

satisfied by devoting to this kind of reading the leisure hours of the day of rest; the temptations to a Sunday holiday which are so plentifully provided by many of the railways, and which have a most powerful attraction for the working man "in populous city pent;" all these things have no doubt been extending and deepening the alienation of the people from the Church and from religion. But had they not been left so much as sheep without a shepherd, the effects of all these influences would have been in a great degree diminished. Had the Church done her part, the world would have had far less advantage. Had the people not been first neglected by the Church, they would not have been so readily led to forsake her services.

But, after all, the pressing question remains, What is to be done? What can we do to bring these multitudes within the reach of Christian teaching, to rouse them to think about their souls and to look forward to another world? What can we do to bring them to church—these navvies and costermongers, and cinder-sifters, not to speak of the more thriving mechanics and journeymen; for have they not all souls to be saved, and is not the Church responsible for them all? But when we speak of it as the work of the Church we do not mean that it is the work exclusively of the Church's Ministers. It is the work of every member of the Church in his vocation and ministry; a work for all who have realised their own standing in the Church of Christ, whose hearts have felt in any measure the constraining power of Christ's love, who have with any sincerity taken up their cross to follow Him.

To some, it may appear as if the work were almost hopeless. Let any one go and see for himself the condition of the people in some of the poorer districts of the Metropolis. Let him walk through some of the narrower streets, or even the crowded thoroughfares, of Lambeth, of Shoreditch, of Bethnal Green. Let him look at the men and women whom he meets, and always with this one thought present to his mind,—"These are immortal souls, the children of One Heavenly Father, and many of them, perhaps most of them, living without God and without hope. What will become of them? What can be done for them? What can I do for them?" Let any one face these thoughts and grapple with them, remembering too that these

souls are but thousands among tens of thousands, and only in one great city among many; and can we wonder if sometimes the answer to these inquiries comes to the heart speaking less of hope than of despair? But let a man go home from depressing scenes like these, and read for himself in the Word of God, the messages of mercy and the promises of love; let him think what he means when he says, "I believe in God, the Father Almighty, and in Jesus Christ, His only Son, our Lord, and I believe in the Holy Ghost," and surely his faithless fears will give place to believing hope, and he will feel that He Who has said, "All souls are Mine" can never mean that these godless souls should be left to perish in their ignorance and their sin. It may perhaps be said that every thoughtful man is quite convinced of this, and quite ready to acknowledge it; but along with this theoretical conviction there is surely a vast amount of practical forgetfulness of the duty which it involves. Most of us, both ministers and people, must often have felt in what subtle ways the more hopeless thoughts creep into our minds and influence our daily lives; how often we are tempted to excuse ourselves to our own consciences for not doing more, from a feeling of the hopelessness of what we have to do. And if the Church at large is ever to be roused to enter, as a Church, upon the great work of evangelizing the people, the first thing to be done, by the help of God, is to bring home to the hearts of her members a conviction, powerful enough to rouse to actual exertion, that the work is waiting to be done, and that God is waiting for us to do it. We cannot feel that as yet any such conviction has possessed the Church at large. When we think of the handfuls of District Visitors scattered up and down throughout our great cities, or of the little groups which have gathered themselves in Sisterhoods and Brotherhoods here and there, and even add to these the more independent workers, who privately and often secretly are doing what they can for God, each in their own sphere and in their own way,—we may, indeed, feel deeply thankful for such services as these; but we cannot feel that they are more than the exceptions to one prevailing habit of inaction on the part of the Church's members: at best, they are only the first-fruits of a harvest yet to come, the pioneers of a noble army who will one day rally round the Standard of the Cross. We are still far from the fulfilment of the Church's prayers, "that

every member of the same in his vocation and ministry may truly and godly serve Thee." There are multitudes of Christian men and women, not only professing to lead Christian lives, but many of them with hearts truly touched by the love of Christ and strengthened by His Spirit—who yet pass day after day without one single definite effort to make known to others what they so deeply value themselves; perhaps without even one real definite prayer on behalf of the godless creatures who hurry past them in the streets or dwell around their doors. Yet there are few more hopeful signs of the Church's life and earnestness than the conviction which seems to be gaining ground among us that there is a great work for the laity to do, and that they must somehow be brought to do it. And we must all have felt how touching was that desire of our good Archbishop on his bed of sickness, at a time when he lay hovering between life and death, that God would spare his life in order that he might do something towards the organization of the laity for the work of the Church. May that desire be abundantly fulfilled! We cannot but feel that even now there are many indications of some great movement in this direction. The Associations and Unions, Guilds and Confraternities, Sisterhoods and Brotherhoods, which are springing up every day, are surely not only testimonies to a great truth too long forgotten, that every member of the Body of Christ has its special powers and special duties, but are also preparations for the recognition and the realisation of another truth equally ignored, that the Church itself ought really to be one vast Association of Lay Helpers, one glorious Brotherhood and Sisterhood combined in one, one great Confraternity of Faith and Hope and Love, labouring together with Christ in the extension of His Kingdom.

But if the lay members of the Church are to be awakened to this proper sense of their duties and responsibilities, it will not be done so much by any general appeals or extended organization, as by the efforts of each Parish Priest among the people committed to his charge. And even here it will not be achieved by any large scheme which will embrace everybody all at once; but by gathering, together, one by one, fresh workers, and by being ready not only to welcome but to employ each man or woman, or child, who comes with the offer of help, whatever their position, their capacities, their opportunities may be. This

is by no means an easy task, but it is possible; and it is quite essential in any system of lay co-operation. Not unfrequently it is from failure here that efforts to secure lay helpers break down and come to nothing. Some word of exhortation, or some movement in the Parish has stirred the hearts of a number of the people to offer themselves as helpers in the work of the Church. But time passes on, and the Parish Priest does not find employment for them. The enthusiasm which would have been maintained and deepened by the healthy stimulus of active work, now languishes, and at last dies; and it is hard to awaken it again when the work is found. It is of the first importance that the Parish Priest should be ready to find work for his workers. Even though the work be never so trivial or unimportant, it will supply a want till something better is found. If it do not effect much for the good of the Parish, it will have been most beneficial to the workers themselves. Even in the human body each single member is not always very actively or usefully employed; but its employment in any way whatever (which is not absolutely hurtful) maintains it in a state of healthy readiness to do its higher work when the occasion comes. But in a populous Parish, there ought to be no want of work for all. We have been too apt to think of District Visiting and Sunday School Teaching as almost the only outlets for the energy of the Church laity. There are a hundred other occupations which will suggest themselves to any Parish Priest, if he will set himself to think about it. Let him only consider how many things there are which he does in the course of every day, which are not really part of his special work at all; which do not in the least require to be performed by an ordained minister; and what is most important, things which occupy more or less the time which he might be giving "to prayer and to the ministry of the Word;" let him note these things down as he observes them day after day, and he will soon have a number of occupations more or less important which he can at once suggest to the various workers who come to him with offers of help.

There is one other point in connection with this part of our subject, which we must not leave unnoticed, although it may possibly appear to belong to the region of sentiment, rather than to that of practical work. It will be no little help towards

maintaining in full efficiency the lay work in our Parishes, if the workers be banded together in some kind of union, and made to feel that they have a special fellowship with one another within the larger Communion of the Church. We know well the objections which are often urged against such arrangements, and we do not deny their force. We have already admitted that the Church is the grand Union, the great Confraternity of the Saints, and that the Christian need not desire, and cannot realise, a higher or closer fellowship than that of membership in the Body of Christ. But we must all feel how imperfectly in the mean time such fellowship is realised or even understood; and we believe that the smaller unions and associations of which we are speaking, besides more immediate benefits, may well help forward a more true appreciation of the unity of the members in the whole body of the Church. Such a Union or Association for lay workers may very well be confined in the first instance to a single Parish. It need have nothing very formal about it; but there might be a special prayer provided for the members, to be used by them either separately in their homes, or in weekly gatherings among themselves. And at least once in every year, on some appointed day, all might be gathered together in the Parish Church, to join together in some special service, and above all to receive together the great Sacrament of Christian fellowship, the Communion of the Body and Blood of Christ. In some cases, it might be possible to add some special obligation, to be voluntarily undertaken, to do each day or each week some particular work of piety and charity. In some Parishes there might be a desire to wear some little Christian emblem, or to bear some special name—and what then? Surely these are among the things indifferent, concerning which we may concede, as well as claim, a true Christian liberty, and neither sit in judgment upon others, nor fear their judgment as regards ourselves.

These things, as we have said, may be felt to belong to the domain of sentiment; but who, that knows anything of human hearts or human actions, is ignorant of the power of such sentiment as auxiliary to the most practical work? Who will say how much the sentiment of a distinctive dress has helped to maintain the great Volunteer movement of recent years? nay, how much it had to do with the unflinching courage of the

"thin red line" which stood the shock of an opposing army? Was there nothing in its being red? Would it have been altogether the same, if it had been a line of fustian and of velveteen? And shall we grudge the nursing Sister her distinctive dress, or the lay worker the little emblem of his Guild or Brotherhood? May we not use and consecrate even sentiment in the service of Christ?

We have been speaking of the position and duties of the laity in carrying on the work of the Church among the people. It is surely one of the most important, as it is becoming one of the prominent questions among those which engage the attention of Churchmen in the present day. It is a subject requiring great wisdom, but still greater charity. And it needs courage too; courage in the Rulers of the Church, as well as in both priests and people. We must not be afraid of it; for it is no new device of modern times, but the ordinance of God Himself and the custom of the Primitive Church. The diversities of gifts which are distributed within the Church by the operation of the Holy Ghost, are not confined to the clergy, but they are given to every man *πρὸς τὸ συμφέρον*, for the general good. And if we desire a proof that these gifts were not only given but exercised in the Primitive Church, we have only to read the records of the Apostolic age, or the long catalogue of lay helpers which we find in some of the Epistles of St. Paul. Were not the seven deacons of the primitive age only seven laymen formally set apart, as lay helpers and lay preachers, as almoners and evangelists? Was not Apollos another instance of a lay preacher less formally appointed, a man moved by love to God and to the Lord Jesus, to testify, even with very imperfect knowledge, to the truth which he had himself received? And might not the Church of our day do well to imitate the example of the Apostles in recognising such men (for there are many of them) and giving them both liberty and authority to exercise their gifts among the godless multitudes of our great cities? Or, again, were not Phœbe and the other devout women who, like her, laboured in the Apostolic Church, the forerunners of our Sisters and our Deaconesses, our District Visitors and Sunday School Teachers of the present day? In the face of such facts, and of the overwhelming work which lies before the Church in her relations to the people, it is certainly a matter

for some surprise and for much regret that only here and there, after years of discussion and deliberation, has there been any formal recognition on the part of the rulers of our Church of the services of her lay members, or any real organization on the part of the Parochial Clergy of the lay helpers who are already working, or are prepared to work, in their respective parishes. Has not the time come for some more general action on the part of the Church, when on all sides we find the expression of a growing conviction that something must be done? Had we not better try any one good scheme than wait till we can devise the best scheme which is conceivable? While we wait, souls are perishing, and the Church is losing her opportunities; her more earnest lay members are looking away from her borders, towards the open arms of Rome on the one side and of Non-conformity on the other; and while we are preserving our uniformity and our dignity, we are stifling, or at least neglecting, the earnest spiritual life which is stirring in the hearts of men and women all around us, ready to work with us and to work for us, if only we will send them forth. If ever the masses of the people are to be recovered to the Church, if ever we are to win their souls to Christ, it will be done not by the ministration of the clergy only, but by the combined efforts of both priests and people, labouring together for the glory of God in the power of the Holy Spirit, and in obedience to the great Head of the Church.

There remains, however, a distinct work for the rulers and officers of the Church, and to the consideration of this point we must now address ourselves.

Beginning at the highest offices in the Church, we feel tempted to enlarge upon a subject that of late years has occupied much of the attention of Churchmen, viz. the increase of the Episcopate. It is a question which has a most important bearing upon the subject of this Essay, but it deserves a much more careful treatment than it could find within the limits of the space which could here be allotted to it, and it must therefore be dismissed with a few sentences only. If indeed we were to adopt the notion of a Bishop's office which seems to find acceptance with the *Times* newspaper and a few of its contemporaries, we should scarcely feel disposed to join the cry for more Bishops. The idea which in such quarters is enter-

tained must, no doubt to some extent, be a reflection of the public opinion of men of the world, otherwise it would not find expression in the daily press. But we are inclined to believe that, at least among Churchmen, there has been during late years an unmistakeable growth and development of a truer estimate of episcopal duties, and that few would now be willing to regard a Bishop as a mere functionary of the State, or to join in the somewhat amusing expression of surprise on the part of the *Times*, that the Archbishop of Canterbury should have thought it any part of his duty to attend the conferences of his country clergy, seeing that "no Secretary of State would allow himself to be devoured in this way by his subordinates." Happily for the Church, our Archbishops are something more than Secretaries of State, and at least for some time past have shown themselves to be deeply conscious of the higher obligations resting upon them. But just in proportion as the Bishops themselves realise the vast extent and the urgent importance of their special functions, and peculiarly at this era in the history of the Church, so will the necessity become greater for an increase of the Episcopate; while, on the other hand, nothing will so tend to rouse the lay members of the Church to a conviction of this necessity as the exhibition before their eyes of Bishops discharging to the best of their power their more purely episcopal and spiritual duties, and doing even in one or two corners of a vast diocese what ought really to be done in every part of it. It is difficult to exaggerate the influence which might be brought to bear not only upon the Clergy but upon the laity in our populous parishes, if their Bishop could be seen among them a little more frequently than at an annual Confirmation, and could be present at the conferences not only of his Clergy but of his lay helpers; coming among them not merely as an officer of the Church but as a Father in God, as the friend and guide and counsellor of both Clergy and people; and the words of a Bishop spoken from the pulpit of a Parish Church, not on any special occasion, but simply as the exhortation of one of the Chief Pastors of the Church to a portion of the flock over which the Holy Ghost had made him overseer, would, even if he were no extraordinary preacher, carry with them a weight and leave behind them an impression which would powerfully aid the Parish Priest in his efforts for the good of his

people. We do not forget—but rather remember with the deepest thankfulness—how, among the Bishops of our larger dioceses, there are not a few who are seeking at great sacrifices and with much risk to their own health and strength to exert their influence in this very way; but this only makes us feel all the more how urgent is the necessity that there should be a sufficient increase of the Episcopate to enable these duties to be performed far more fully and efficiently than they can possibly be under present circumstances, and without entailing upon the Bishops themselves the risk of ruined constitutions and premature decay from the pressure of a burden too heavy for them to bear.

But we must pass from the bishops to the clergy, for upon them, after all, the work will chiefly fall, of bringing the influences of the Gospel to bear upon the masses of the people. When one thinks of the position of a Parish Priest in the present day, entrusted with the care of from ten to twenty thousand souls in one of our great cities, one is tempted indeed to ask "Who is sufficient for these things?" We are not sure but that the question is sometimes asked by the Parish Priest himself, and answered out of his own heart perhaps in a tone of some despondency. But against such a state of feeling he must most earnestly watch and pray. Nothing will so paralyze his efforts or weaken his influence in his parish as this kind of faithless fear, that he will never be able to make any real impression upon the multitude of souls committed to his care. Let him only set to work with a loving hearty faith that it is God's work and not his, and that it will have God's blessing, and he will soon feel abundant reason to believe that his fears were groundless, and that there may be a very real gathering in of the harvest even where the labourers are few. He may often feel, as he makes any single effort for the good of his people, that it is like throwing a stone into the deep sea, which for a moment ruffles the surface and then is no more seen. But let him remember that at least the stone is there, and that even so the fruits of many a work and labour of love will never be truly known till the sea shall give up her dead.

What, then, is the special work of the Parish Priest in bringing the influence of the Church to bear upon the people?

Does any one really expect that it will be done by two or three

Sunday Services, a monthly Communion, a Wednesday and Friday Litany, and perhaps one evening sermon preached on a selected evening of the week, and all done in strict obedience to the Act of Uniformity; the prayers beginning with the inevitable "Dearly beloved brethren," and, at least on week days, read from beginning to end without a note of music, or at the most with a single hymn? Does this really draw the people to the church; and if they came, would they be likely to come again? How well one knows the look of a congregation in these week-day services; the half-lighted church—the handful of godly people who really love the house of God—the little group of aged poor, often annuitants of the church, and perhaps receiving that most objectionable form of relief called Sacrament money, the monthly reward for attendance at the Lord's Table. Have not many of us groaned under this dead routine, and longed for something more real and more hearty? Is it hopeless?

We can, of course, all lay our finger on cases where things are different from what we have described above; where a popular preacher draws a goodly gathering of his people round him on a Wednesday evening, or where an elaborate ritual attracts night after night a tolerably large congregation. But we are not all great preachers, nor are we all Ritualists. We may not have the gifts for the one, nor the inclination for the other. Yet surely the Lord of the Church has not left us "destitute of His manifold gifts, nor yet of grace to use them to His glory." And if the Church of England—if any Church—is to do its work for Christ, it must not be dependent upon exceptional gifts or exceptional circumstances. The work must be done by means which are within the reach of all, or almost all, her ministers. What means can be suggested with such an end in view? We propose to devote the few remaining pages of this Essay to answer this inquiry. There are, however, some preliminary considerations which have an important bearing upon the subject now before us.

First of all, our efforts must all be guided by this one great principle,—that our ultimate object is not to fill the church, but to win souls; to awaken, to convert, to guide, to direct, and to edify individual Christians: in short, to make them ready, one by one, for their true life in a better world. We have therefore not only to bring them to church, but to keep

them there; and, more than this, to get hold of them: to make a personal impression upon them; to raise them above that dead level of mere devout hearing either of prayers or sermons, which too often represents the worship of a large proportion of our congregations. The old superstition is not yet exploded which South quaintly described as a belief that we can be "pulled up to heaven by our ears." Our inquiry, then, as it concerns the outlying masses of our people, really divides itself into two. How are we to get them to come? and then, What are we to do with them?

As regards our first question. It is evident that the ordinary Services of our Book of Common Prayer are arranged with a view to the worship of the faithful. They are intended for those who are willing to come, and who are so far instructed that when they do come they may be able intelligently to join in the worship of the congregation. But the Church has a missionary work to do even within her own borders, for which the Prayer-Book was never intended. When we stand surrounded by thousands who never come to church at all, and who, if they did, would as little understand the service as if it were in Latin as of old, we must be content to lay our Prayer-Books aside, and to look for some means by which we may first draw the people to the church, and then edify them when they come. This will not be accomplished by the ringing of a church-bell, nor by a notice board detailing the hours of divine service. The godless, reckless, and too often profligate men and women who abound in our populous parishes care for none of these things. They have heard the bell, and they have seen the board for years past, but they have no notion that they have anything to do with them. We must, in some way or other, go out into the highways and hedges, and compel them to come in. We must go to them, or send to them, one by one, and entreat and persuade them to come, if it were only once, to the house of God. It is easy to object to this kind of proceeding, that they will come to oblige us, and not because they wish to come; that they will come perhaps, expecting some temporal benefit, rather than desiring any spiritual good. Our answer is, that these lower motives are not to be too closely scrutinised, so long as they are likely to lead to higher good. We remember that of the multitude who came to Christ, and found a blessing for their souls, a great

proportion came in the first instance simply to seek relief for their bodies; and that the motive which gave the first impulse to the returning steps of the prodigal son was the thought of the bread enough and to spare which he remembered in the house of his father.

In suggesting this kind of personal appeal to the non-worshipping population, we would not be supposed to expect a system of house-to-house visitation as a part of the clergyman's regular parish work. We venture to think that in a parish of 10,000 or 15,000 people, or even with much smaller populations than these, such a process is for all practical purposes impossible, and at the best unprofitable. In his regular ministrations, the Parish Priest will find abundant opportunities placed in his way for personal intercourse with those who neglect the services of the Church. The providence of God will open doors for him where his work will be doubly blessed, because his way will be made plain before him. No doubt he must labour, as St. Paul exhorts, *εὐκαίρως, ἀκαίρως*—"in season, out of season"; but the *ἀκαίρως* will become *εὐκαίρως* when thus overruled by God. And although not thus personally brought into contact with all the thousands of his people, he may, by the help of his laity and by other agencies, bring his influence to bear upon them indirectly, and by no means ineffectually, in many different ways.

But that which he cannot do habitually, he may yet be able to accomplish in an exceptional way, and such an occasional effort may be productive of both extended and permanent good among his people. This is the principle involved in what are now known as Parochial Missions; such efforts as that which has only recently been made, and with very remarkable results, in London and its neighbourhood. It is a recognition of the Missionary character which belongs to the Church of Christ even in a Christian country. It is an attempt to reach and to lay hold of the careless and the ungodly by efforts which could not be continuously sustained, but which from time to time may most effectively be employed. It has three distinct functions, each of which in its place is essential to the success of the whole movement. It has to draw the people to church; to impress them when there; and to retain a hold of them when thus impressed. Our regular Sunday services, confessedly, fail to a large extent in the first of these requirements. They

do not draw this class of people to the church. Our special Cathedral services were intended for this purpose, but there is considerable doubt how far any large proportion of the worshippers is drawn from the class of which we speak, and whether the greater number are not really beguiled from their own Parish Churches, or even, to a considerable extent, from the Dissenting Chapels. And to those of us who have been present at these services, not in the seats of the favoured few, but among the multitude, there is something more than a doubt how far the majority of the preachers can be heard at all, except by those who are placed within a very moderate distance of the pulpit. We are far from wishing to disparage these services: on the contrary, we are most thankful that our glorious old Cathedrals should be used in this way in the service of God and for the good of His people; and if these services are nothing more than acts of worship on a magnificent scale, they need not be fruitless in developing and quickening the spiritual life of the worshippers. We greatly need the renewal among us of the idea of worship apart from instruction. It was for generations forgotten in the Church—it is still almost wholly unrecognised in the ministrations of the Sects. Nor is this idea of worship intelligible only to the educated worshipper; it is singularly accessible even to the poorest when once it is put before them. But after all this has been conceded, there still remains the undoubted fact, that our Cathedral services are manifestly defective in one most necessary feature of all Missionary efforts to win back wanderers to Christ and to His Church; they make no provision for gaining a personal hold upon the people when once they have been gathered in—not even when they have been seriously impressed. The multitudes come and hear, and many of them are perhaps for the first time aroused to some real concern about their souls and about the life to come; but they return to homes which are full of depressing influences, and to their own parishes where, perhaps, they scarcely know even by sight their appointed pastor, and would never dream of seeking him out. As for the preacher whose words had come home to them, they may never see him again till they stand before the judgment-seat of Christ; and thus the good impression, which might have been deepened by personal dealing, is suffered to vanish away, or to use our

Lord's own words, "Then cometh the Devil and taketh away the word out of their hearts, lest they should believe and be saved." Now a Mission, such as we have mentioned, endeavours to supply this defect, and to meet the three distinct requirements which we specified above—viz., to draw the people to church — to impress them when there — and to keep hold of them individually when thus impressed. It is evident that, even with these objects in view, a great variety of means may be adopted in order to their accomplishment, and there can be no reason why this diversity in detail should not exist. But it is very important that these features of a Mission should be clearly understood, and stedfastly kept in view, especially at the present time, when such efforts have been as yet very rarely made, and are very little known to the Church at large. The recent Twelve Days' Mission, to which we have already alluded, has helped to some extent to make the subject more familiar to the members of the Church. But unfortunately public attention has been chiefly drawn to certain somewhat eccentric proceedings in one or two parishes, rather than to the great features of the movement itself, and to the essential character which belongs to it as an effort to bring the influences of Christ's Church to bear upon the masses of the people. Without entering into minute detail, it may be desirable to give a short sketch of the general course of proceeding in connection with such a Parochial Mission. First of all, there must be a most careful preparation for a long time previous to the actual commencement of the Mission itself. The Twelve Days' Mission was announced as an assault upon Sin and Satan. The expression, which was somewhat ridiculed, is abundantly justified by the language of our Lord Himself. But it further suggests the necessity of which we are speaking, that the fortress to be assailed, the house of the strong man armed, should not only be carefully surveyed and skilfully approached, but that all the materials of the siege, and the chosen men for the time of assault, should be prepared and equipped to the best possible advantage with a view to their greater success. It is however of the first importance to bear in mind that in this wrestling "against principalities and powers, the rulers of the darkness of this world," the victory is gained "not by power nor by might, but by My Spirit, saith the Lord of Hosts;" and the clergyman

will do well to make this his first concern; to gather together his godly people, that they may unite their prayers with his for the outpouring of that Holy Spirit, and that they may continue to pray unceasingly before and during and after the Mission itself, that power from on high may be given to the workers, and that the people may be a willing people in the day of that power. Arrangements must then be made for a visitation of the parish—every house, and if possible every family—or every man and woman, if it might be. Where this can be done by the clergy themselves it is much to be preferred; indeed only where this is impossible, ought it to be delegated to others. But when it must be so, then the lay helpers must do the work, and by preference the more godly and experienced among them. Each should carry with him a message of invitation in simple, forcible language; earnest and affectionate, but free from exaggeration; dictated by a "spirit of power and of love and of a sound mind." With this printed message may be given also the word in season, if opportunity offers; a single kindly word, which will often gain acceptance for the message itself. This visitation of the Parish will take some time, but it ought immediately to precede the work of the Mission. The Mission itself may vary to a great extent in its details. It may extend over a week or over a fortnight, or some intermediate period. The nightly sermons may be preached by the same preacher, or by a succession of preachers who ought to be selected as having peculiar gifts suited to this special work. What is wanted is simple, but powerful, awakening sermons—preached freely and not read—spoken as by man to man—yet spoken with authority as by a messenger from God, charged with a message of mingled mercy, love, and warning to His people. Let there be no formal service of Evening Prayer, or even the ordinary Litany, but some few collects or simpler portions of the Services suited to those who are unused to worship, and have rather come to hear. The hymns, which may be taken from some special collection, ought to be earnest and hearty, and in the truest sense Evangelical, and sung to well-known or simple tunes. There ought to be no attempt to discourage the attendance of the regular worshippers. It will be good for themselves to hear again the first principles of the doctrine of Christ; or perhaps to get a real hold for

the first time of the truth as it is in Jesus. And they will be there to show kindness to the strangers in many little ways, and to help them by their prayers. They may also see some whom they have visited in their homes, or whom they have been trying to influence, and after the service is over they may persuade them to remain to the after-meeting, of which we now proceed to speak. This is perhaps the special feature of the Mission, for it is the means employed to effect the best and most important of the objects of which we have spoken above, viz., to win a personal hold upon individuals, and to deal with them singly with a view to their conversion, their restoration, or their instruction, as the case may be. Here again there is abundant room for diversity of detail. Under the form of an Instruction Class or Bible Class the meeting may be held in the church itself. The people who stay may be gathered together in some part of the church most convenient for the purpose; the preacher or the Parish Priest speaking to them simply from the Reading Desk or Lectern, or walking up and down among them, while all are at liberty to listen or to pray or to go, as they may feel disposed; but never, if possible, without some attempt being made to induce them to come again, or to see their clergyman privately, or to leave their names and addresses that he may visit them. It may be asked, in reference to these arrangements, "What becomes of the Act of Uniformity?" We do not profess to give a complete answer to that inquiry. It is a large question, and one of considerable difficulty. We believe, indeed, that it is now held by the highest authorities, though never judicially decided, that after the Daily Morning and Evening Prayer have been duly said, the clergyman is at liberty to use even within the Church, any other service, so long as it is wholly taken from the Book of Common Prayer and from the Holy Scriptures. But we fear—we had almost said we hope—that many of the clergy allow themselves a greater latitude than this; and we should be thankful to see provision made for other services in our churches, the materials for which might be gathered from different services—not excluding even extempore prayer, so long as each separate form of service had the sanction of the Bishop of the Diocese. This of itself would allow of our churches being much more frequently used, and in many other ways than has been the custom; and it is certainly very desirable

that they should be used in as many ways as possible, consistent with their great purpose as houses of prayer consecrated for the worship of God. If the Act of Uniformity stands in the way, is there anything so sacred in this particular statute that it may not be modified or, if necessary, abolished?

But to return to the Mission. It may be thought more desirable that the after-meetings should be held not in the church, but in a school-room or other suitable place as near as possible to the church itself. To this meeting those will be specially invited who have been at all awakened or aroused by the Mission Sermon, or who are in any degree anxious about their spiritual state. This limitation is important, in order to prevent the meeting from becoming only another religious service, with no special character or purpose about it. There is no reason why some others should not be present, especially a few of the more devout of the parishioners, both men and women, who may be very helpful in various ways in the course of the meeting. Where it can be easily arranged, it is desirable to separate the men and women, by placing them as they come in on different sides of the room. The conduct of the meeting must then be left to each Parish Priest, to be arranged as he thinks best, and as God may guide him. But, generally, a hearty hymn is the best beginning, and there ought, if possible, to be a special collection of hymns adapted to the purpose, and used, if possible, both in the church and at the meeting. After the hymn will follow prayer by one of the clergy—extempore of course, for the Prayer-Book was never meant to be used at such a time, and would be quite unsuitable, except a very few special portions, which may often be introduced with much benefit. A few stirring, earnest words might then be helpful to the people, pointing out to them the great necessity for decision; or deepening the sense of sin and its danger; or setting forth very simply the promises of God's love and mercy in Jesus Christ; or suggesting to them some one definite subject for their prayer at that time. Then let all kneel down in silent prayer. It is now that the special work of the meeting must be done—the dealing with individual souls. It will rarely happen but that the Parish Priest will know, especially as the Mission goes on, one or two troubled souls with whom he may begin; and while all are kneeling, he and his friends will move about among the

people, speaking a helpful word, or offering a quiet prayer with one and another, and finding, as he goes about, ever one or two more who will be ready for his help and counsel. It is here that the one or two of his experienced godly people may be employed, not only like himself, in praying with others or praying for them, but also in finding out for him as they leave the room, those who stand in need of his ministrations, and whom he may visit at their own homes; or who may come to see him at the times which he will already have appointed.

And so the work goes on, night after night, generally with increasing numbers and with deeper earnestness, till the Mission is over. By this time there will always be a certain number, who have been more or less brought into personal communication with their clergyman; and for weeks to come it will be his work to guide, and tend, and instruct them, till they are established, strengthened, and settled in their spiritual lives. Of these there will probably be a considerable number who have been strangers to the House of God for many a day; men and women whom nothing but a special effort of this kind would probably have gathered in; and whom a mere sermon might indeed have aroused for a moment, but left them to go back again into their old ways for want of pastoral care and individual teaching. But the blessing is not confined to themselves. Each one will have an influence for good, perhaps quite silently, in the court or alley where he lives. He may have much to bear in the taunts and sneers of his neighbours; but even one or two of those who persecute him may be drawn to the church themselves, if only through curiosity, and may find, perhaps, when there an equal blessing. We have great faith in the leavening power of spiritual life; and among the fruits of a well-conducted Mission this is one of no little importance—the impression which it makes even on those who are not directly brought under its influence. It is like what we read of in the Apostolic Church, where, besides the number of converts who became obedient to the faith, it is said that "fear fell upon every soul." And it is not only among the multitude of the ungodly, but among the regular worshippers at the Parish Church, that this kind of influence is exercised. Every Parish Priest, who has had any experience in Missions like these, could tell how even his own communicants have been blessed at

such a time by a deep sense of the presence and the power of the Holy Spirit in the work which was going on, and by realising for themselves the power of effectual fervent prayer. He could also surely tell that among those who had reason to thank God for the work and its fruits, none could more truly do so than himself, in feeling, like St. Paul, that he had been "comforted together" with his people by their "mutual faith."

We have dwelt at some length on this kind of work, because as yet it is somewhat strange to Churchmen, and because we believe it to be a most powerful agency for bringing the work of the Church to bear upon the people. It is not, of course, to be looked upon as a normal part of the Church's work, but as an exceptional effort to meet a special and urgent want. Its great purpose is to arouse and to awaken and to lay hold of those whom the regular services of the Church have failed to reach. It will perhaps be objected that there is a certain degree of excitement connected with it, which is alien to the spirit of the Church. If the Church of the last 100 years is meant, the objection is not to be gainsaid. But if by the Church is meant the Catholic Church, the Church of the Apostles, we contend that the spirit of that Church is by no means opposed to such Missions as these, any more than it is opposed to Mission work among the heathen. If men are living without God and without hope, it matters little whether it be in New Zealand or in Bethnal Green; or rather it is more sad and more perilous in the latter case, because for the most part they have all the responsibilities of baptized men. But is it anything more than the Church has done at other times, though, perhaps, in different ways, from the times of the Apostles down to the days of Wesley, and those who laboured with him? And shall we go on to lament, as most of us do, the coldness and deadness which left to that eminent Revivalist and his followers no rest within the bosom of the Church, and yet look coldly on a work like this, when it is done by loyal Churchmen, moved by the love of souls for whom Christ died? We venture humbly to believe that if the great Apostle of the Gentiles had himself been located in a London parish, he would not have contented himself with the regular services of the Prayer-Book, nor with the ringing of the church-bell, but would have gone out himself, into the courts and alleys, with Aquila and Priscilla, with Apollos and Phœbe,

as well as with St. Luke and St. Silas, to compel men to come in, and, whether in an upper chamber or in the school of one Tyrannus, would have endeavoured by all means to save some. But if any should desire a more studied defence of such exceptional efforts, even where the element of excitement may be supposed to find a place, let him read the striking sermon of one who will not be suspected of any sensational tendencies—John Henry Newman,—and he will find in what is there said of the "Religious use of excited feeling," a powerful argument for giving it a place in the great work of winning souls and of bringing men back to the way of salvation. There are, of course, other means by which the careless and the ungodly may be sought out and reclaimed—and none of them ought to be neglected. There is the personal visitation by the clergy themselves and by their District Visitors, or other godly helpers; but what are they among so many? Then there is the cottage lecture or the Bible class. But do they really succeed in drawing in those of whom we have been speaking? And is not their failure to do this work (however effectual in other ways) owing in no little degree to the absence of that very excitement which is found in the well filled church, with its hearty hymns sung by a multitude of voices; or the warm and earnest tone of the Prayer-meeting, with that mysterious, but most real, spiritual influence which diffuses itself around awakened souls, and, most of all, when they are pouring out their hearts in prayer? By all means, let us have these agencies, and every agency, for we need them all. If we plead for somewhat irregular efforts, it is because the condition of the Church is abnormal, and its circumstances exceptional at the present day. There is no reason why these efforts should not be made in perfect loyalty to the Church's system, although they may seem to be beyond the limit of her appointed services. Their ultimate purpose is to bring men to the knowledge of that same truth which the Church is commissioned to teach—the truth as it is in Jesus; and their immediate object is to bring them to the Church herself, to be led by her into the paths of righteousness. For, after all, the Church's proper work, or rather her more regular work, remains to be done for these very souls who have been brought back to her influence. It is after a Mission, such as this, that the Church's services, in all their completeness, become more

than ever needful in the work of the parish. It is now that the Parish Priest, even more than at other times, must make "full proof of his ministry." How this is to be done we must presently consider; but must pause to speak of one other exceptional agency for bringing into the Church the outlying multitudes. We mean what is commonly called "open-air preaching." This at least, will be allowed to be thoroughly apostolic. Nor are we aware that objection is often made to its adoption. The real difficulty lies in the very small number of those who have courage to attempt it, or who believe that their natural gifts would entitle them so to do. There is, however, a good deal of misapprehension upon these points. If preaching in the open air means preaching in Trafalgar Square, or in Hyde Park, or at the Obelisk in the Blackfriars Road, we do not wonder that most men should hesitate to put their powers to the proof under circumstances such as these. But it is just in places of this kind that open-air preaching is least needed and also least effective. At the best the preacher gathers a congregation composed to a large extent of those who are passing on their way to or from their own churches or chapels; and for the rest, even if they should be impressed, there is no provision made for bringing them under personal influence and instruction. We may venture to add, that, so far as our experience goes, the persons usually employed in such cases are not very likely to produce much impression even upon those who stop to hear. Some months ago, it fell to our lot to hear, very frequently, the addresses of street preachers in some of the great centres of public thoroughfare. The result of our experience was far from satisfactory. For the most part, the preachers were men of feeble power, ill-instructed and sparingly educated, profluent of spiritual talk and equipped with certain commonplace doctrinal arguments; but sadly wanting in anything like preaching power, or in that hearty simplicity of utterance with which a man should address his brother men about the concerns of their immortal souls. They might be very earnest men, but the position was one for which nature had not gifted them and God had not intended them. But it is not in places like these that open-air preaching is most needed or of most avail. It is in the courts and alleys of the populous Parish—not where men come and go, but where they dwell and

where they loiter. It is here that the Gospel must be preached to men who will not go elsewhere to listen. And, although even here it is a difficult work, yet it is by no means so difficult or so hopeless as in the open street or in the crowded thoroughfare. Here too we know, for the most part, to whom we are preaching. They will sit at their windows or stand at their doors, not always very reverently or very attentively, but rarely disrespectfully; they will at least hear what the preacher has to say, and there is little temptation for them to move away till he has finished. A visit to the court or alley on a following day will probably reveal some little impression made, and will almost always call forth some remark about the preaching, which may open the way to a more personal exhortation. Such a work as this would indeed be most effective in bringing the influences of the Church to bear upon the people. But who is sufficient for these things? Sunday is almost the only day on which these courts and alleys are not emptied of their inhabitants, at least of the men, while daylight lasts. But Sunday is a day already full of occupation for the Parish Priest, and unless he be a man of unusual power he will hesitate to add to his other work the serious burden of an open-air address. This kind of work, however, need only be occasional, not regular, and it should not be of long duration. There need be no preliminaries, except perhaps a hymn to gather the people. It is not a service, and ought not to be made to look like it. Above all, the address must not be long. Brevity in the pulpit is a virtue; in the open air it is a necessity. But, again, why must this work be done by the Parish Priest? Why should there not be an order of men set apart for this very thing; men with special gifts, peculiarly fitted to do the work of an Evangelist, Mission-Priests as distinct from Parish Priests? And once more, why should it of necessity be done by clergymen? May not a layman receive a mission to preach the Gospel in the open air? and might not some who now preach without a mission have been retained for the Church, if such a mission had been given to them? Why should not such a man, if rightly gifted, be sent forth, when approved by his Parish Priest and sanctioned by his Bishop, to testify of what he himself has learnt of the Gospel of Jesus Christ? It may be that his style would not be very polished, nor his theology always exact; but these things

are not of the first importance. Indeed, it is the smattering of technical theology possessed by some street preachers which makes them useless for the work they have to do. Talleyrand would have said that their theology was intended to conceal the truths of religion—and it might almost be whispered that the remark would apply to other than street preachers. But let a man be moved by a true love to Christ and a love for souls, and fairly instructed in the teaching of the Church, and though his preaching may have little about it, either of rhetoric or of exact theology, it will have a natural eloquence and a spiritual power which will be far more telling and far more likely to win men both to hear and to obey. Like every other faithful preacher, his object, of course, must be to draw men not to himself, but to Christ and to His Church. His preaching must not take place during the hours of service, but best of all immediately before, so that the sound of the church-bell at the close of his sermon, may fitly come in as an invitation from the Church calling the wanderers in to her fold.

In connection with the work of godly laymen, it may be well if at this point we say a few words as to a matter which will often prove one of anxiety and of difficulty to the Parish Priest; we mean his relations to those who are working alongside of him, but who have separated themselves from the Church to join the ranks of Nonconformity. On every account, we should say, let him give up all thoughts of opposing or hindering them. Let him, as far as possible, ignore their position as schismatical teachers, and regard them (if baptized) simply as members of the Church, who habitually absent themselves from her services. The surest antidote to their errors is to preach the truth; to preach it definitely and distinctly, as the Church has proclaimed it; to teach our people the meaning of Church principles and the Church's system; and thus, in all probability, to prevent them wandering away, with itching ears, to the nearest meeting-house, where some eloquent preacher is attracting an ignorant multitude, who have never been taught to distinguish between truth and error. How many churches there are, or at least have been, where, so far as the sermon is concerned, one might be a hearer for twelve months together, and scarcely discover whether it was the church or the conventicle. But we may go even further than this. With all their

ignorance and contention too, our Nonconformist neighbours have been so far preaching the truth; often, indeed, in a very one-sided and imperfect way, but still so as to rouse men to some concern about their souls, and even to win them to Christ. What remains for us is to teach them, so far as they may come under our influence, the more excellent way. Many a soul, which has been thoroughly awakened under the ministry of the Sects, would feel the comfort and the strength of the Church's teaching, and its inestimable advantages as a guide and support for the Christian's life, and for his spiritual progress; and it is wonderful in how many ways such persons do come, more or less, within the sound of the Church's voice. It has been often said that persons awakened to spiritual earnestness under the teaching of the Church are apt to go off to Dissent, to find an outlet and a sphere, which the Church denies them, for their new-born zeal. Unquestionably it has too often been so; but there is no reason why it should be. And, on the other hand, there are cases known by every active Parish Priest where persons, reared and nurtured in Nonconformity, have found the satisfaction of their higher spiritual longings in the teaching of the Church. Let this be our hope, and the object of our efforts and our prayers. We firmly believe that the Church has nothing to fear from Dissent so long as there is equal earnestness and faithfulness in the church and in the chapel. We should, indeed, be unfaithful to our Church, and to our Lord, if we could indulge such a fear; for it is His truth which we teach, and His commission which we bear.

We must now speak of the Services of the Church themselves. How are we to make them most profitable and most acceptable to the people when once we can persuade them to come? We have already implied, in an earlier part of the Essay, that the churches should as far as possible be free to all comers. We do not wish to exaggerate the importance of this point, nor do we suppose that any large number of people who have not been in the habit of coming to church will come simply because the church is free. But it certainly removes out of their way a great hindrance to their coming, and enables the Parish Priest to invite them far more freely to the House of Prayer. We are not even disposed to enter upon an immediate crusade against all pew-rents, although we heartily wish that there

were no such institution. We are as yet in a state of transition: the old order is giving place to the new; but violent and indiscriminate changes would really hinder and not help the great object we have in view. We are disposed to think that there is a good deal of unreality in some of the arguments which are often adduced in opposition to the pew system. It has many grave evils connected with it; but many of them are accidental not essential, and might to a great extent be remedied. The one thing against which we ought certainly to protest, in the name of our Lord, is either the thrusting of His poor into obscure corners, or placing them in prominent positions, but in seats so inferior to the rest, that they are ignominiously ticketed, as it were, as pauper worshippers. We have never been able to see why in a church of which half the sittings are free, the line of division should not be drawn from end to end; leaving all on the one side to the pew-renters, and on the other to the poor. All would then be equally well placed without any invidious distinction, and yet without that intermingling and personal contact of the rich and poor, which we believe to be quite as distasteful to the poor as to the rich. But it would certainly be better still if even the distinction of payment and non-payment could be done away with, by the abolition of all pew-rents whatever, leaving the maintenance of the services of the Church entirely to the free-will offerings of the worshippers. Even then, however, we are not prepared to allow that a church perfectly free and open to all comers would necessarily be the best in our large town parishes. There is a great deal to be said in favour of the ancient custom of appropriating without payment, so long as it is done to rich and poor alike. One very common evil is thus to a great extent prevented. Wherever there is either a striking preacher or an attractive ceremonial, the free and open church is filled to a large extent by non-parishioners, who come and go and are lost sight of by the Parish Priest, while his own flock are often excluded by the more eager sightseers from a distance, or wandering hearers with itching ears. But where the church is appropriated not in pews but in sittings (as they are unhappily called), according to the real wants, not the claims of the parishioners, and where all vacant seats are thrown open as soon as Divine Service begins, the church may be just as well filled, and with this

great advantage, that the clergyman knows for the most part who the worshippers are, and is thus able not only to do the work of an evangelist but of a pastor as well; not only to call his flock together from week to week, but to feed them from day to day. In the case of persons who have been awakened and brought to church by any of the means we have before described, it has often a steadying influence by no means unimportant, if a place can be allotted to them which they may regularly occupy, and thus feel themselves accepted members of the congregation among whom they worship. We are inclined to believe that this system has not yet been fairly tried in populous places, and we feel somewhat confident that it would prove much more successful in making the parish church available for the parishioners than even the more popular arrangement of an entirely free and open church. It may perhaps be said that the parochial system has failed in our large towns, and that it is hopeless to maintain it. We entirely dissent from both of these statements. The system has not failed, but it has not been fairly tried; nor can it be hopeless to maintain it, although it may be under somewhat modified conditions, if we set ourselves to work each in our own parishes to do what we can.

We now pass to the Church Services. There is much to be said on this point; much more than we have space to say, for we stand face to face with the questions of Ritual, of Revision of the Liturgy, of rearrangement of the Services, and other matters upon which we hope to receive some help and guidance from the long-expected Report of the Ritual Commission. On these points, however, we must content ourselves with a very few words. First, as regards what is called Ritual. We certainly require a much greater brightness and heartiness about our services than is found in a large number of our churches at the present day; and an increased amount of music will generally be found attractive and popular with the poorer classes. But *est modus in rebus*, and we are inclined to doubt whether a full choral service is altogether suitable for the regular Services of a parish church. It may very well be introduced from time to time, to mark the greater Festivals or on other special occasions; but we are disposed to think that a more simple Service would be more generally useful at other

times, and more generally acceptable to the masses of the people. As regards other matters of Ritual, in so far as they bear upon the subject of this Essay, we cannot forbear to express our conviction that the readoption of vestments or of practices not only long disused but also associated in the minds of the multitude with the worship of the Roman Church, will be a hindrance rather than a help either in bringing back to the Church those who have forsaken her services, or in quickening and sustaining their true spiritual life. We are well aware how many Parish Priests there are who differ from us on this point—men experienced in their work and devoted to it—above all, men full of love to their Lord, and longing to win souls for Him. We can only speak from our own experience, and express the convictions of our own minds. On the other hand, we believe that a more reverent and orderly celebration of Divine Service, than was formerly common among us, is both acceptable to the people and helpful to their devotion. It is but rarely that any difficulty would be found (supposing a fair amount of wisdom and forbearance, and at the same time firmness on the part of the Parish Priest) in substituting a surpliced choir for the performers in the gallery, or in abandoning the unmeaning ceremony of the preacher leaving the church in the middle of the service to exchange his surplice for an unauthorised vestment, in the form of a black gown. Wherever there is any real spiritual life working in a parish, there will be little difficulty in making such changes as these where they may seem desirable. It is, of course, in vain to hope that no objections will be made; but it will for the most part be found that the opposition arises not among the really earnest worshippers, and least of all among the poor, but among a few self-important persons who can give no adequate reasons for their objections except that they object.

The mention of the black gown naturally brings us to the pulpit; and here, again, we are treading on difficult ground. After all that is written periodically in the public Press with reference to sermons, we are inclined to think that on any single Sunday there are more good sermons preached throughout the country at the present day than could have been heard at any previous time. We sometimes hear it said that if we had sermons like those of Tillotson and Jeremy Taylor

we should have no difficulty in filling our churches. Our own impression is that we should very soon empty them. We believe that if either the Archbishop or Bishop had been located in the present day in a London church he would very soon have found his congregation leaving him and seeking for homelier and more pointed instruction elsewhere. The day of pulpit orators and of popular preachers is probably past. Providentially there is no great demand for them, as there is certainly no supply. We have heard it said by the rector of a well-known London parish, in a fashionable neighbourhood, that he knew only three or four preachers who could draw a congregation sufficient to fill that parish church on a Sunday afternoon. But this need not be a matter of very great regret. What we need in the present day, and especially among the poor, is not so much preaching as teaching; not the formal sermon based upon the conventional text—but simple, earnest pleading with men in the name of Christ, urging them to seek their rest in Him, and to make their peace with God through His precious blood. We must speak to our people in plain and pointed terms—not in rounded periods and rhetorical phrases. We may be homely without being vulgar; we must speak to men as if we meant it; not as if we had to say something, but as if we had something to say. The upturned faces which we see before us are the faces of men and women struggling with the temptations and dangers of the world—wrestling with its principalities and powers. Each single face represents an immortal soul, which is looking to us for instruction and guidance, for spiritual counsel, for help in the narrow way. Our people are sent to us not merely to be pleased or instructed; but to be aroused from carelessness, to be convinced of sin, to be led to Christ, and to be made ready for His kingdom. The continual recollection of this will be, after all, the best security for effective preaching.

There is, however, one further consideration, which ought to influence the preaching of the Parish Priest wherever his lot may be cast, but above all if it be in a populous parish. He must aim at the conversion, and not only the edification of souls. He must remember that even among those who come to his church there must be a great many whose hearts are not really right with God, who have no real hold of Christ as the

Saviour of their own souls; who need to be not only instructed and comforted, but to be aroused and enlightened; in short, to be converted, to be turned from darkness to light. Surely there has been among us much too little of the kind of preaching which would meet such cases as these. But, on the other hand, nothing is more remarkable or more hopeful in the present aspect of the Church than the very great increase of such preaching, even among certain extreme parties where it could least have been expected. And it is a very important fact that this kind of preaching possesses a powerful attraction for the very persons who need it most. This would certainly not have been anticipated *a priori*, but we believe that experience proves it to be universally true. We cannot but feel that this is in some measure owing to its dogmatic character. However the world may say, as it has of late been frequently saying, that dogmatic teaching does not suit the temper of our age, there is indisputable evidence to the contrary, in the fact that it is notably teaching of this kind which not only attracts but also maintains its hold upon the multitude. It would be beside our purpose to investigate the rationale of this phenomenon, although it would not be hard to suggest some possible reasons why, even in this liberal and intellectual age, and amidst the unusually busy and absorbing occupations of men's daily lives, the preaching of dogmatic truth should have an attractive power, such as does not belong to any less definite teaching. But the fact can scarcely be questioned. Let us look at the men who in our own day are drawing together the greatest numbers of the people, whether to hear or to worship, and we shall find that it is those whom the world would denounce as most extreme or most bigoted, those who have their own very definite views of the truth of Christ and the creed of His Church, who, looking at it from different points of view, with different idiosyncrasies and different educations, have yet grasped firmly one special aspect in which it has presented itself to their own minds, and are expounding that particular side of God's infinite truth, often, it may be, not unmixed with considerable error. These are surely the men who, at the present day, are drawing the multitudes after them; not the more liberal and philosophic teachers whom the intellectual few and the easy-going world delight to honour. Is it not this definiteness of teaching which in a large measure

gives to the Church of Rome its powerful hold upon the people within her Communion? Was it not this which characterized the sermons of Wesley and of Whitefield in a past generation, as it does those of the most successful preachers in our own day? And are we not bound to remember the striking testimony of one of the Evangelists, in explaining the remarkable impression produced upon the people by the teaching of our Blessed Lord, "He taught them as one having authority and not as the Scribes?"

But the preaching of the Parish Priest, in order to be really effectual, must be definite and dogmatic in a special direction. His one great object is, not to draw people to himself, but to win souls for Christ, and to keep them safe for Him; and this can only be accomplished (is it unnecessary to say it?) by setting forth the great truths of the Gospel—the plain message of salvation—the simplicity that is in Christ. If there is one thing more than another upon which depends the success of the work of the Church among the people, it is surely this. Like St. Paul, we must preach unto them "Jesus and the Resurrection." It is only in Christ Himself that they will find the supply of all their need, and in that blessed hope the satisfaction of their longings. Surely in that Name which is above every name, there is a mighty power to touch men's hearts, to awaken their hopes, as well as to arouse their fears; above all, to win their love; and if the preacher would draw men to Christ, it must be by setting Christ before them.

But we need, at the same time, and especially in our poorer parishes, more frequent exposition of the written Word of God. The bulk of our congregations really know very little of the Holy Scriptures. They hear the appointed Lessons, but they have no help to the understanding of them. Would it not be well for us sometimes, instead of the conventional sermon, to take one of the daily lessons, or both, and simply to explain their general meaning, their purpose and connection, and then to make some application of them to individual souls? Or if the sermon may not give way, is there anything to prevent this being done shortly and simply at the end of the third Collect or at some other pause in the service? Or might it not be done at the close of the Service in the form of an instruction for the benefit of any who might care to stay? We have reason to

believe that no small number would be willing to do so, and especially in our poorer parishes. Surely, in some way or other, more might be done to explain to our people the simple meaning of those Holy Scriptures which are able to make them wise unto salvation. It has often appeared to us that the question addressed to the Deacon at his ordination—"Will you diligently read the Scriptures unto the people assembled in the church where you shall be appointed?"—is hardly satisfied by the occasional reading of one or more of the appointed Lessons in the service of the day. Was not something more than this intended? And why should it not be done both on Sundays and on other days, either with or without any previous service? In spite of our cheap Bibles and extended education, there can be very little doubt that there is a wide-spread and lamentable ignorance of the Holy Scriptures and of their simple meaning; and anything which would help to remedy this evil would be a most important step towards bringing the influence of the Church to bear upon the people. There is another subject only second in importance to this, of which much the same may be said—we mean the Book of Common Prayer. How little our people, even the more educated among them, appreciate the full significance,—sometimes scarcely the simple meaning of the prayers in which they join from day to day in the Services of the Church. Would it not be well for us to devote some portion of our time, or, at any rate, at certain seasons, not merely to preaching sermons on the Prayer-Book, but to explaining the simple meaning of the prayers, beginning with the Exhortation, the Confession, the Absolution, pointing out the connection between them, and even explaining in its order each single phrase? How much a work like this might help, not only to attach people to the Church, but to deepen their devotion and make the prayers come from their hearts as well as from their lips. We have reason to know that such teaching as this would prove not only acceptable but helpful to large numbers of our people. And no one with this subject before him need fear that he is passing by more important matters, for the Liturgy is so saturated with Evangelical truth, that while unfolding its meaning he would assuredly be preaching the Gospel.

We are now brought to another point in connection with the

Church Services. We believe that few things would help more to attach the people to the Church than a full and faithful adherence to the Church's system. How grievous our neglect has been in this matter we need not stay to relate. It is only within the last few years that even the day of our Lord's Ascension has been at all generally observed, and as to other Festivals and Holy Seasons, they are still, to a great extent, ignored in a large number of our populous parishes; or, at the best, they are observed in such a way as to be anything but attractive to the people. It is too often supposed that people of the poorer sort will care for none of these things. We can testify to the contrary. Only let them see that the clergyman himself attaches importance to them, and does not slur them over in the easiest way he can; let them be plainly taught the meaning of each Festival or Holy Season as it comes round; and let there be on every such day the full Services of the Church, the Morning and Evening Prayer, with a short sermon at one or both, and the celebration of the Holy Communion, as the Church manifestly has intended; let these things be done, and the Services made as hearty as possible, and it will be found that the people will not only avail themselves of their new privileges, but will value them too. As regards the Holy Communion, it has a special usefulness for the poor at such times as these. Many of them who find it difficult to come either at an early or mid-day celebration on the Lord's Day—women especially, whose husbands will not spare them on their only day of rest and of feasting—will gladly avail themselves of the opportunity of the Saints' Day Communion. We have known instances where they communicated upon these days, and upon no others. But, independently of any such accidental benefits, the observance of these seasons is really a most important element in the teaching of the Church. Her Calendar is a reflection and counterpart of her Creed. Year by year, in regular succession, she sets before her people in this most striking way, the great facts upon which her faith is based. And it is for the very poorest and least educated that this kind of teaching is best adapted and most required. How vividly it impresses upon them what they daily profess to believe—the Nativity, the Sufferings, the Death, the Resurrection, and the Ascension of our Lord, when one by one these truths are set before them in the

special Services of Christmas, of Lent, of Good Friday, of Easter, and of Ascension Day, as well as on many of the lesser Festivals! What a golden opportunity may be found by the Parish Priest at these holy seasons, of teaching his people to realise their own interest in each of these great events in the life of their Lord and Saviour, and thus stirring up their hearts to love Him more and serve Him better!

But, again, there is another duty which the Priest owes to his Church, and which, like other duties, will bring with its fulfilment a sure reward—we mean the Daily Prayers. And if anywhere these Services are likely to be helpful, both to himself and to his people, it is certainly in our crowded parishes, and among a population of labouring poor. The Morning Prayer may not gather many worshippers, but there will always be a few, and it will be, at least for the Parish Priest himself, a blessed preparation for the day's work which lies before him. But in the evening, if the hour be late enough and the Service short, he may reckon on not a few even of those whose days are spent in laborious toil. At such a time he will do well to add some little teaching, as well as singing, to the prayers. A few simple words spoken after one of the Lessons, explaining its general meaning, or after the third Collect, upon some more general subject, never exceeding from five to ten minutes at the most, will prove most valuable to those whose whole knowledge of spiritual things is really acquired in church, and for whom the Sunday sermon is often far less helpful than some such simple teaching as we are now suggesting. But there is one at least of the Sunday Services which might be made far more useful to them than it is if, again, the Church's rule were faithfully observed, of Catechizing, in the presence of the congregation, the children of the schools. There are many parents who, with a little persuasion, might be induced to come to hear their own children catechized, and who might often learn from their lips as they answer, or in any case from the teaching of the Parish Priest as he sums up their lesson, truths which they would far less willingly, perhaps less easily, have received, had they been directly set before them.

But further we earnestly hope, for the sake of the poor, that our churches, especially in these crowded districts, may be more generally open for private prayer. Even if it were only for

one or two hours in each day, it would be of no little advantage, but better still if it might be all day long. When we think of the toiling men and women who spend their days amidst the noise and tumult of the busy world, and even their mornings and evenings amidst the distractions of over-crowded and comfortless homes, what a blessing might it bring to their spiritual life if they could find within the House of God, the one quiet haven of rest which was left to them in the world; a place where they might offer up their simple prayers to their Heavenly Father, or even commune with their own hearts and be still. Such a privilege they must, of course, be taught to value; but we believe they would not be slow to learn. One by one, we might press it upon them as opportunity offered. Those of them who were communicants might be taught to make it their place of daily preparation for the Holy Sacrament, bringing with them their little manual, or perhaps finding one provided for them there. Men out of work might be persuaded, while they had leisure, to seek there "first the kingdom of God and His righteousness" in faith that other needful things would be added unto them. Women expecting their times of trouble might learn to pray for strength and protection in the same sacred place where they would afterwards offer up their thanksgiving. With these and such like special cases, a beginning might well be made, and others would soon follow, when these had led the way. How many might thus be taught to love the habitation of God's House; still more to love the Church, their spiritual Mother, which had so cared for their souls; above all, to love Him whose gracious invitation would be thus continuously sounding in their ears, "Come unto me all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest."

We have reserved to the last one suggestion, which we venture to think is of the deepest importance in connection with our subject. The Church has a work to do in the perfecting of the saints, as well as in the conversion of sinners. Have we not sometimes been tempted to forget this? Is it not a most important part of our duty towards our flock to endeavour to develop, to elevate, to perfect the spiritual life of our more godly people? and might it not bring an unspeakable blessing to the rest of the parish as well as to themselves? There is a remark made somewhere by Robert Suckling, one of the holiest

and most faithful of England's parish priests, that "the scarcity of high saints causes the abundance of low outcasts." It is a truth which has a most practical application to the subject now before us. We have spoken before of the leavening power of spiritual life: we feel it to be one of the most mighty influences which can be brought to bear upon the masses of the people. Let it be a special part of our work to nurture this spiritual life in those in whose hearts it has already been quickened through the constraining love of Christ. Let us gather them together in little groups in quiet places, to join with them in meditation on the Word of God, meekly kneeling upon our knees. Let us unite with them in prayer on behalf of our people; let us commend to their private prayers some one or two of those whom we are bearing on our own hearts. And it will be strange, indeed, if there should be no outgoings of spiritual power from such spiritual fellowship, which may do a mighty work for God in the hearts and lives of His careless and godless children. One of the brightest features in the condition of our Church in the present day is surely a reviving and very real faith in the power of intercessory prayer. We believe that even yet our faith in this is but as the grain of mustard seed. Only let it become a great tree, and what may we not expect from its fruits?

It may be that this deepening of spiritual life—this increase of personal holiness—is the special work which is needed for the Church, in these days of busy toil and intellectual activity; and there are around us many indications that such a work is even now begun. Within the century in which we live, we have already seen a revival of faith, and a restoration of worship; is it too much to believe that the Church is now going on to perfection in the renewal of her spiritual life? If this be as yet too much for our faith, it is, at least, not too much for our prayers. The answer to these prayers will be like life from the dead to both Church and people.

We have already far exceeded the limits which we had proposed for this Essay, and yet we feel as if we had but lightly and most imperfectly touched upon some few points of a subject of the deepest moment to our Church and her people. We have written in unavoidable haste, under the continuous pressure of other unexpected Parochial work. But that very work has both deepened in us the sense of its vast importance, and con-

firmed our experience of its hopefulness, even under circumstances not the most favourable for success. We have a most happy confidence in the future of the Church in relation to its work among the people. We believe that never has there been so much zeal and earnestness, above all, so much spiritual power, as is now working among us from day to day. Our very difficulties and dissensions are themselves, in many instances, the fruit of increased activity, and of growing spiritual life. There is a growing faith in the Person and power of the Holy Spirit, and in His presence among us in the ministrations of the Church. There is more of prayer for His help, and a greater readiness to look for His blessing. If these things be in us and abound, we need not fear. Our work is one of vast anxiety and difficulty, but God is on our side, and in His strength we shall yet bring home the blessings of His Church to the masses of the people.

W. D. MACLAGAN.

ESSAY XI.

CONCILIATION AND COMPREHENSION:

CHARITY WITHIN THE CHURCH AND BEYOND.

By ARCHIBALD WEIR, D.C.L.,

Vicar of Forty Hill, Enfield.

CONTENTS OF ESSAY XI.

- The importance of the subject; it is a characteristic of the Age; isolated writers have formerly broached it; Jeremy Taylor; Glanvill.
- The Anglican Church must be ready to answer the question of the Age.
- She is passing through a crisis, and entering upon a career of wider usefulness.
- Charity the temper and principle of discussion.
- The spread of education and the periodical press tend to increase Parties and Party-feeling.
- Three, and only three, great Parties in the Church: the Scriptural—Traditional — Rational. Minor and shifting varieties of these. No reproach to the Church that she embraces them all. This seen by light of her Mission; which is to harmonize these three Forces.
- These Forces and Parties considered, and their respective values assigned. The mutual indebtedness of the Scriptural and Traditional Parties.
- Three classes of Mind inclined, respectively, to these three Principles.
- Inference that the Church must contain these three Mental Types, and that they have each a work to do for God.
- Herein basis of Conciliation. Bad and good examples to show that such Conciliation is not impracticable. Hints for bringing it about.
- From Conciliation we pass to Comprehension.
  - Schemes of Reunion, and Plans of Comprehension, not part of present purpose.
- The Church's duty to the Age in respect of Comprehension.
  - Incidental remarks upon Toleration.
  - (1), The Church's Duties; (2), Her Advantages; (3), Her Encouragements.
  - Hints for furthering Comprehension.
  - Hopes of the Future from the Facts of the Present.
- Conclusion.

CONCILIATION AND COMPREHENSION:

CHARITY WITHIN THE CHURCH AND BEYOND.

Among the many grave problems which now press with such urgency for solution upon the minds of thoughtful men, there is none of more weighty importance, because none of wider scope in its bearings upon a Christian nation, none of closer contact with the personal well-being of the members of the nation, than that which is set forth in the title of this Essay. To say that this problem has been thrown up into special prominence by the convulsions which have disturbed the moral, religious, and political world in very recent times, does not weaken the force of its urgency, or diminish the strength of its claim to consideration.

The principles which it involves are by no means of modern growth, although the guise in which they at present appear before us may borrow its fashion and its colour from the passing conditions of the age. I would, at the outset, invite particular attention to the terms in which the subject of this Essay is stated. "Conciliation and Comprehension: Charity within the Church and beyond." A moment's thought will convince us that while the latter part of this sentence presents a condition of things which has come, in these modern times, to be regarded in a spirit totally different from that with which it was universally treated in the early ages, the former portion exhibits two ideas which may be described as the peculiar up-growths of the latest period of religious thought. In saying this, it is not, of course, intended to assert that these ideas are so absolutely novel in our day that they cannot be discovered in the theories of individual writers and thinkers of a former age. But there is a wide difference between the opinions thrown out by isolated minds and the growing convictions of society. The former may be the prophetic—though unwitting—harbingers of the latter, generations, or even centuries, in advance. Certainly

no one will deny that, whatever a few courageous thinkers of old may have hazarded upon these points, it has been reserved for our own time to witness a strong public sentiment growing and deepening in their favour. Jeremy Taylor's 'Discourse of the Liberty of Prophesying,' and the *Philosophia Pia* of Joseph Glanvill, are works which, so far from being the reflection of, were remarkable as strongly-phrased protests against, the prevailing opinions of the period in which their authors lived. In fact, their chief interest now consists in their striking anticipations of views which, after the lapse of six generations, have become the convictions of all intelligent men. No one at the present day turns to them for instruction how he ought to think, but for information how these two gifted writers thought at a time when such thinking as theirs was eminently exceptional. To put it in another way, and to borrow a figure from the science of geology, we may say that such works as those referred to lie upon the surface of the literature of the seventeenth century like boulders of granite in a region of sandstone; whereas in the literature of the nineteenth century they would be recognised as croppings-out of the prevailing stratum. In their own day they were abnormal; in our day they would be characteristic.

This passing allusion to certain writings of two contemporary divines, who flourished in an age which provokes, in many interesting points, both contrast and comparison with our own, has been made for the purpose of indicating the fact that the Anglican Church has exhibited individual efforts to do that which, as a Christian Communion, it is clearly her part in the coming time to take in hand; namely, to face the facts of social and scientific progress; to bring into harmony the past with the present; and to be ever ready to give a candid and fearless answer, as each age shall ask, in its own way and in its own tone, the question, "Are you still the 'householder, which bringeth forth out of his treasures things new and old'?"

That the Anglican Church is, at the present time, placed in a position which may truly be called critical, no one, of her communion, or outside her pale, will be disposed to deny. She has, indeed, passed through many crises of a more exciting character, more turbulent in their elements, and imparting a higher dramatic effect to the tableau of her history; but through

none more momentous. To go to the flames with Ridley and Latimer, to go to the scaffold with Laud and Charles, to go into exile with Clarendon, to go to the Tower with the Seven Bishops—these are incidents which arrest attention by their adventitious grandeur; but their essential importance is far inferior to that of the present situation. Her enemies, whether on the right hand or on the left, recognise, and with an ill-concealed exultation point out, the dangers with which she is threatened. The ever-ready similitude of a stranded ship, whose sides are gaping wide to the furious waves, is applied to her by one group of bystanders; another group perceive, in the anxieties which absorb her attention, the natural setting-in of the process of decay upon a system of belief and morals, out of which all vitality has been driven by the advance of triumphant reason. It is well to look in the face of difficulty; it is well also to attend to the interpretation which it receives from unfriendly observers. More particularly is it wise to do this with regard to a Church, whose most loyal, as well as most judicious, adherents are convinced that what gives to her position the aspect of danger, and occasions so much triumph without and so much alarm within, is the deeply momentous fact that a career is now opening out before her, in which she may proceed with expanding usefulness, even towards those who most emphatically renounce her communion, and most gladly anticipate her fall.

In the following pages, I propose to consider the present situation, and, from a survey of its facts and tendencies, draw some conclusions as to the mission of the Anglican Church in the future. The form which the investigation will assume, and the spirit in which it should be conducted, are indicated by the heading of the paper: Charity is not only the temper in which it should be discussed, but also the principle upon which its results must be based. The conciliation of parties within her pale, the comprehension of sects beyond, are worthy objects of our Church's efforts; and both are practicable by means of charity. For that which is "the bond of peace" will produce conciliation, and that which is "the bond of perfectness" will bring about comprehension. *Τηρεῖν τὴν ἑνότητα τοῦ πνεύματος ἐν τῷ συνδέσμῳ τῆς εἰρήνης*;[*] this is the true principle of con-

---

[*] Eph. iv. 3.

ciliation. Ἐπὶ πᾶσι . . . . τὴν ἀγάπην, ἥτις ἐστὶ σύνδεσμος τῆς τελειότητος;* this is the just method of comprehension.

Taking a superficial view of the state of opinion in the Anglican Church at the present time, one is inclined to think that its parties are more numerous, and that party-feeling is more intense, than at any previous period. There are many circumstances which combine to give this complexion to the religious condition of the age. The spread of education, the cheapness of books, the multiplication of newspapers, have all told in the direction of increased activity about religious questions. The last particular is the most influential. Before the present century a "religious" newspaper did not exist.† Controversies were carried on through the restricted and cumbersome means of pamphleteering. There was no cheap and rapid agency through which the movements of parties could be made known, or the opinions of partisans be circulated. Whether as the effect or the cause, certainly as the concomitant fact, of this state of things, the party movements were few, slow, and simple; and partisan opinions made their way in the Church at too leisurely a pace to be exciting, and often lost themselves in the ground over which they flowed in a scanty and sluggish stream. But all this is now changed. Not only are the primary colours of theological opinion represented in the periodical press, but every tint of every colour has its journal or its magazine. The effect is to give the appearance of endless division and ceaseless strife; and they who do not consider the matter deeply, nor take into account all the facts both of the present and the past, are apt to conclude that the quickened life of the Church, and the heightened zeal of Churchmen, are tending, amidst some transient successes, to bring about the ultimate dissolution of the whole fabric. This, of course, is the gloomiest view which the most atrabilious pessimist can adopt. But it is not, for that reason, to be wholly disregarded. It has its value, as all extremes have, in giving a spring by which a recoil to a more healthy state of feeling may take place. Admitting the variety and antagonism of parties within the Church, it is at

---

* Col. iii. 14.

† The 'Record,' I believe, was the first, and that was started in 1828. The 'John Bull' was, indeed, commenced in 1820; but it did not assume the character of a religious newspaper till many years afterwards.

least consoling to reflect that the Church has hitherto been large enough to contain them all. Granting the facilities for sharp and frequent controversy which the multitude of "religious" newspapers affords, and the many deplorable things which by their means are prevented from dying, and often made to live in exaggeration, it is satisfactory to observe that alliances, blendings, compromises—in short, the conciliation which comes of the interchange of opinions between different minds—are brought about through their agency. But this by the way.

It only needs a little reflection to convince us that there are not, there never have been, and there never can be, more than three well-defined parties in the Church. A little further thought will likewise show that there must always be three parties, in more or less advanced stages of development, each in its way representing, and endeavouring to obtain supremacy for, one of the three distinct views of religion which are permanent constituents of Church opinion, namely, the Scriptural, the Traditional, and the Rational. There may be combinations of these which produce other varieties, but they are derived, not primary, divisions of Church opinion, and are shifting, not constant. The facility with which such combinations are made, in other words, the sudden growth of new "views," is thought by many of her friends to betray a functional weakness in the Anglican Church, whose strength they conceive to lie in her power to repress "viewiness," and to shape, in a mould of iron, the whole communion to one type. Her enemies are pleased to regard the evil as greater still: they look upon it as an organic, not merely a functional, disease; and mark the period of its fatal issue. Happily both are wrong. It is the strength, not the weakness, of the Anglican Church that she contains within her fold many varieties of opinion. It is her glory, not her reproach, that she admits to the "one fellowship" at her altars the different types of mind which, from the necessity of the difference in their structures, have elaborated those varieties.

While, therefore, we assert fully and fearlessly that the strength and the glory of our Church lie in that very fact of the diversity of opinions which prevails within her communion, we must be careful to remember the reasons which can alone justify this assertion. They will be found when we have ascer-

tained what is her mission as a witness for the truth of God, and as a herald of the Gospel of Christ. Certainly, if we assume her mission to be to deal out Christianity to the world according to a rigid and unalterable rule of the exact length of the Thirty-nine Articles, she has obviously failed to fulfil it. Or, if we suppose it to be the maintenance of an infallible ecclesiastical system, her failure is equally remarkable. If, however, we interrogate the history of the past, and make a fair and candid estimate of the facts and tendencies of the present, we shall conclude that the real mission of the Anglican Church is to bring into harmony, and give effective corporate action to, the three great forces which reside in the Christian religion, and, by a due adjustment of their respective functions, to apply the eternal truths of the Gospel to the spiritual, moral, and intellectual wants of all who come within reach of her influence. What those three forces are I have ventured to intimate by the three words Scriptural, Traditional, and Rational. The three parties in the Church which respectively embody them are known only too well by the popular party names, which carry with them something invidious, something contrary to charity, and which for that reason I shall use now, and not again, in the present Essay — Low Church, High Church, Broad Church. For the rest, I desire rather to look upon each section as its adherents would themselves regard it; and to recognise the force which resides within it, and the principle which guides it, as they themselves would have them recognised, namely, as being a healthy force and a true principle, which it would be deeply injurious to the Church to be without.

(*a*) It will be as well to make some observations upon these three religious forces or principles, and consider how the parties which retain them may improve their action by exercising them in a more conciliatory spirit. By the Scriptural principle I understand that undivided allegiance to Holy Scripture, and exclusive appeal to its authority, as the only source of doctrine and the only rule of practice, which has found its most famous and emphatic expression in the dictum of Chillingworth, "The Bible, the Bible only, is the religion of Protestants." Taking these words in their strictest and baldest sense, it would not be difficult to show that they are, and must needs be, untrue to fact. But undoubtedly they are a correct statement of the only prin-

ciple by which a large section within the Church, and numerous sects outside, will admit that they are guided. And although it may be true that the Church would lose greatly if her members were entirely, or even chiefly, of this opinion, yet it is quite as true that her best interests, as a witness for Divine truth, are subserved by having the Scriptural principle firmly held and jealously guarded. For it may be said to be the *vis viva* of her system; the Holy Scriptures and the Liturgy in the vernacular are evidences of its being so; and if, in the bewilderment which an overbearing assertion of the Traditional or the Rational forces may occasion, any one should forget what the Anglican Church has that she can call her own, he need only lay his hand upon his English Bible and his English Prayer-Book to recover himself from his distraction.

(*b*) The Traditional principle has its own special value in going to make up the completeness of the Anglican system, and it undeniably has a charm for a large number of minds who, probably, are little open to influence from either of the other forces. In fact, its action is more in the nature of a fascination than that of either of the others could be; and, by addressing itself to the imagination, the taste, the poetic feelings, it has the command of the largest sphere for its operations. As a matter of fact, one has only to recollect the last Anglican service one may happen to have attended, to be convinced that if all that is traditional were withdrawn, the whole service would fall to pieces, and its observance become simply impossible. Or, again, if one consider the general system of Church government, or the general body of Church doctrine, it will be clearly seen that Tradition, in its way, has quite as much to do with them as Holy Scripture in its way; and that, while the latter is appealed to to corroborate or justify them, they came into our hands by the way of Tradition.

These remarks skirt the verge of a question which it is no part of my present purpose to discuss, namely, the relation of Holy Scripture to the Church. But, in passing, it may be observed that both Traditionists and Scripturists will learn much that will tend to conciliate their views and enkindle their sympathies, from a careful and candid investigation of this subject. Surely it ought to be eminently satisfactory to both parties to know that the Bible and the Church—Tradition and

Scripture—meet in most intimate union in the celebration of the highest act of worship, the Holy Eucharist; and that our own Office exhibits that union with impartial fidelity. The thoroughly Scriptural character of the Communion Service can triumphantly be vindicated by the one side; and its close adherence to the most ancient Liturgies can be conclusively demonstrated by the other; while both sides may appeal for proof to those very passages in the Service which are at once evidence that Scripture is quoted in the Liturgy, and that the Liturgy is quoted in Scripture.* Take up the Liturgy, and our Scriptural friends rejoice to find the sacred words of the Testament woven inextricably into the texture of the Office. Take up the Testament, and a subtle, but convincing, criticism displays to our traditional friends the most venerable portions of the Liturgy quoted in its pages. Cannot both parties, while continuing to stand on their respective sides of the subject, join hands in agreement over the possession of the highest attainable example of the rule of S. Vincent of Lerins, "Quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus"?

(*c*) Of the presence of the Rational force in the Church it would almost seem unnecessary to offer any justification: certainly there is no need to assert its existence. That section of the Church which claims most sympathy with it cannot, and in fact shows no disposition to, rest that claim upon any exclusive right to its possession. Putting aside the accretions of prejudice and party-feeling which have gathered round the word "rational," when used in reference to theology, and taking it in its simple and natural meaning, it is clear that the rational principle must be co-extensive with the Church itself, plainly because the Church is composed of rational beings. Of course, it is not attempted to conceal behind this allusion to the primary condition of things, the fact that the rational force, just like the scriptural and the traditional forces, resides with special intensity, and finds most room for bold action, in one of

---

* These words will at once recall to the recollection of every one who has read it, the learned and deeply interesting article on "Liturgical Quotations in the Pauline Epistles," by Dr. John Mason Neale, first printed in the 'Christian Remembrancer' for April 1860, afterwards reprinted in the collection of his 'Essays.' Some very judicious remarks upon the relative positions of the Bible and the Church will be found in Mr. Bernhard's Bampton Lectures—"The Progress of Doctrine in the New Testament," note ix.

the three Church parties. And having regard to the system of balances and counter-forces which Providence has set up in the theological, no less than in the moral and physical worlds, it is impossible to ignore the fact that the rational principle discharges most important functions in keeping religion in the due and truthful centre—a result which the scriptural and traditional forces, though acting with a certain antagonism towards each other, would fail to achieve. It is usual to consider truth as lying in the mean between two extremes, and no doubt there is great convenience in so representing it when treating of ethics. But in theology in the abstract, or in the Church, which is theology in the concrete, it is more faithful to facts to regard truth as a centre between three points equally distant from it and from one another. Or, to express it in another way (remembering always how inadequate, and often misleading, figurate language is, when applied to such subjects), truth is central, and the three circumjacent points contribute their respective shares to ascertaining its position. These three points we have had in view all along, under the names Scriptural, Traditional, Rational. Let us conceive, for argument's sake, that the rational force had been eliminated from the Church, or at least had become so seriously paralyzed that it exercised no appreciable influence; what is this but supposing that the scriptural and the traditional were left to exercise their powers in the most irrational way? It is enough to place the matter in this light, to show how indispensable is the rational principle to the healthy action of the scriptural and traditional principles, or even to their acting at all.

It is not sufficient, however, that we recognise the existence of these three forces in the Church, and admit them to be indispensable to the completeness of its development and the vigour of its life; but we must take into account another fact, namely, that there are three classes of minds which are respectively constituted with strong inclinations towards being influenced by these forces, and possessing a peculiar fitness to give the forces play and scope for their action upon the Church. To put it in another form: the three leading types of mind produce three great schools of thought, and these schools of thought develop into three great parties of action. Now, men do not make their own minds any more than their own bodies. They may injure

them, improve them, modify their natural bias, substitute another bias in its stead by the strength of their will. The mind is greatly influenced by the circumstances in which it is placed, and education confessedly has incalculable power in shaping it and directing its bent. But, after all, there are great leading types of mind which no amount of "artificial selection" can "improve" out of existence; and when we come to regard mental types with respect to the Christian religion we see that there always have been, there are, and there is every reason to infer that there always will be, those three standard types leaning respectively to the Scriptural, the Traditional, and Rational views of religion. This being so, it is but reasonable to conclude that the Creator has just as clearly defined a purpose in endowing His rational creatures with various types of mind as He has in the harmonious variety which we behold and admire in the rest of His works. And when we have reached this conclusion, the next step follows of necessity, namely, that a corresponding variety in views and opinions is necessary to give satisfaction to the minds adapted to embrace them. From all this the proper inferences to be drawn are these: first, the Church, just because it is a divinely founded Society, must be expected to include within its limits such various types of mind as experience shows its Divine Founder has implanted in men. Secondly, the members of the Church should exercise sympathy and forbearance towards those of their brethren whose minds are differently constituted from their own. To put it in other words, the existence of different parties in the Church is not only to be acquiesced in, but also to be frankly and cheerfully recognised; and this recognition should be founded upon the conviction that each party has a work to do, to keep its own special portion of the truth in full view.

Here, then, we have the grounds upon which conciliation within the Church should be based. And now it may be well to look around and see what signs there are of such conciliation making progress amongst us. That parties in the Church—between which, at other times, considerable antagonism prevails,—can on occasion combine for some specific object, we are not without evidence in the ecclesiastical history of our own times: We can adopt Jeremy Taylor's words, and say, "We have seen it that all sects of Christians, when they have an end to be

served upon a third, have permitted that liberty to a second which we now contend for, and which they formerly denied, but now grant, that by joining hands they might be the stronger to destroy the third."* This kind of conciliation cannot be defended on any just ground of Christian principle. Better far that the three great parties should remain in their separate camps, than that any two should form an unholy alliance for the persecution of the third. But such alliances, though deplorable and censurable in themselves, yet serve the purpose of proving the practicability of mutual toleration of differences. They, at least, obey the second precept of S. Augustine's maxim, although they grossly violate the third, "In necessariis unitas, in dubiis libertas, in omnibus caritas."

Happily, however, our experience is not limited to such lame testimony in so good a cause. Of late years an alliance, which may really be called holy, has come about between those two parties in the Church who respectively incline to Scripture and Tradition. The objects for which the alliance has sprung up is the cultivation of the spiritual life in its deeper subjective workings, and for united action in awakening slumbering sinners, and winning souls to Christ.

In order to clear the way for the conciliation of Church parties there are one or two preliminary hints, too obvious, indeed, to be mentioned if the neglect of them were not more obvious still. To hold liberal opinions is one thing: to be liberal in holding one's opinions is quite another. There is little either of blame or of credit in the former. The Scripturist, the Traditionist, the Rationalist are such, for the most part, for reasons over which they have had little control. But all can help the behaviour they observe towards people of different opinions. The broadest Rationalist may be very narrow, the highest Traditionist may be very broad, the strictest Scripturist may be very generous, in the way he treats the other sections of Church opinion. All can be generous, none need be narrow, while each is true to the principles which he feels are essential for his own guidance, and for the faithful discharge of his duty to the Church. St. Paul's sublime discourse upon the excellence of charity, in 1 Cor. xiii., to which all so readily refer, follows, it ought to be re-

---

* 'Liberty of Prophesying,' § 21, 3.

membered, immediately upon his careful demonstration of the "diversities of gifts," and the "differences of administration," and the "many members," in the one body of Christ. To join with the Apostle in his "panegyric of love" is good, but it can consistently be done only when his principles of Christian fellowship are thoroughly mastered, and frankly embraced.

Another hint refers to charity of language. Mention has already been made of the effects of the spread of periodical literature upon the Church. One of those effects is sadly visible in the coining and circulation of party nicknames. But there is a refinement of this abuse which is chargeable to the same cause: I mean the appropriation of some grand comprehensive title to the purposes of sectarian language. The word "Christian" one would suppose to be the most comprehensive of all names by which the baptized believers in the Lord Jesus Christ could be designated. Though first given to the faithful by their heathen enemies at Antioch, it has, like many another title conferred in scorn and received with gladness, been, ever since, the glory of all followers of the Crucified Saviour. Hence it would seem to be the one title upon which all churches, all sects, would thankfully fall back for rest, as in an ultimate and all-compassing unity. Wearied with the strifes which increase and intensify a mischievous spirit of partisanship, all should at least agree in freely according to each other, without distinction, a title which marks all as "partisans of Christ" against sin, the world, and the devil. Yet what more sadly contradictory of this can be conceived than the purely arbitrary limitation of this noble name to a small clique, included within some obscure dogmatic circle, or to a few individuals who may happen to be of the same temperament and disposition in matters of religion? Not less reprehensible is the similar abuse of the word "Catholic." Could S. Ignatius, when he asserted the title for the whole body of orthodox believers as against the heretics and schismatics of his day, have dreamt that, in an age boastful of its breadth of view and generosity of spirit, that title should be appropriated as a partisan distinction by a small section of Churchmen as against their fellow-churchmen, and on account of insignificant points of observance?

Other examples might be adduced; but it is not requisite,

and certainly not agreeable, to multiply instances of the way in which charity of language is "more honoured in the breach than the observance." The two specimens which have been exhibited serve every purpose. They are utterly extravagant and indefensible; and, as regards the sections of Church opinion from which they are selected, they fairly balance each other; and one can only regret that extremes, the union of which upon proper grounds would be matter of unfeigned satisfaction, should meet in the perpetration of a sin against "the bond of peace." How strongly besetting this sin is, especially in the young and enthusiastic among both laity and clergy, there is only too abundant evidence to show. Conceit and self-complacency lurk beneath it; but its most serious evil, as far as the Church body is concerned, lies in the tacit condemnation which this abuse of noble names passes upon all but the scanty few who arrogate them to themselves. And it is an abuse which grows upon those who are once betrayed into it. The consequence is that, just in proportion as they converse upon subjects connected with religion, so are they tempted to draw lines of separation, and set up barriers of exclusion. One of the benefits which flow from Church Congresses is the imperative necessity which members of all shades of Church opinion lie under to eliminate from their language the nomenclature of narrow sectarianism.

And now, from the consideration of what charity demands of Churchmen among themselves, we proceed to discuss its claims upon them towards those of their fellow Christians who are beyond the Church's pale. From conciliation we pass to comprehension. At once it will be seen that this branch of our subject lies in a perfectly different region from that occupied by the other. To conciliate parties within the Church it is necessary to remind them that, by the very facts of their existence, they are committed to a union which their disagreements may disguise but cannot destroy. Cautions against unbrotherly conduct presuppose the fact of a brotherly relationship. Consequently the remarks that have been offered are addressed to parties, cliques, individuals; and, while admitting the differences which obtain amongst them, aim, in the first instance, at reducing those differences to a minimum, and, when the mini-

mum is reached, counselling forbearance in respect of what remains beyond it. To this end it is requisite to point out that it is the duty of every Churchman, in the first place, to examine carefully those points in which he supposes himself to differ from his brethren, in order to see whether they may not be either purely imaginary, or the result of misconception, or intrinsically unimportant; and, when this eliminating process has been honestly gone through, then, in the next place, to accept the residuum of differences in a frank and forbearing spirit, seeking not only to explain, but also to justify, them by reference to the various types of mental constitution. But it is quite otherwise in the case of religious bodies outside of the limits of our own Church. In taking up the question, What does charity require at our hands as loyal Anglicans towards those Christians who are not Anglicans? we readily perceive that it presents two distinct aspects, which, in their respective spheres, demand careful attention. In the first place, each Anglican must consider what rule of charity is incumbent upon him as an individual Christian towards Christians of other communions; he must also consider what he can do as a member of his own Church in furthering its union with other churches. Of his duty as an individual Christian there is no need to say anything in addition to what has already been suggested respecting the discharge of that duty towards his fellow-Churchmen, except that his allegiance to his own Church must ever be kept in the foreground as a regulating principle in all his intercourse with Non-Anglicans. But when we face the other aspect,—the line to be taken in bringing about the corporate union of churches, or the incorporation of separatists with the Church, in a word, comprehension,—we lose sight of the individual, and have only to deal with the Anglican Communion as a body, and the proper attitude towards those who are beyond her pale.

The remarks which have just been made lead close up to the subject so deeply interesting to all Christian people,—the reunion of Christendom. That subject it is no part of my present purpose to enter upon. Let it be left—where the best efforts of able and pious men have hitherto been obliged to leave it—in the region of hope and longing prayer, scarcely as yet with a fair promise of any actual accomplishment. Nor, when

mention is made of comprehension, is it intended to bring forward any "scheme of comprehension," by means of which the separatists from the Anglican Church may be reabsorbed into her body. Plans of union, and schemes of comprehension, highly laudable in their aims, have already been plentifully supplied; but it must be confessed that their praiseworthiness is nearly all that can be said for them. One common weakness besets them all: they all lack the one thing necessary to give them any real force, namely the formal, authoritative sanction of the Anglican Church in her corporate capacity. The overtures that have been made, and the theories that have been broached, for union with the Eastern Churches, the Roman Communion, the Scandinavian Churches, the Wesleyan body, by individuals, or by sets of men, are all good in their intention, but have borne no fruit of practical results; and this because they are amateur experiments, unsustained by the authority of the Church they represent, unwarranted in assuming the sympathy of the great bulk of English Churchmen, and only exhibiting to the communions they make advances to, the single aspect, more or less incomplete, of their own Church in which they themselves are wont to regard her. With respect to such attempts we may repeat what the Monk Barlaam said to Benedict XII., when sent by the Emperor Andronicus to that Pope on a mission about the union of East and West: "A deputation of thirty or forty of our doctors would probably agree with those of the Vatican in the love of truth and the unity of belief; but on their return, what would be the use, the recompense of such agreement?—the scorn of their brethren, and the reproaches of a blind and obstinate people."[*] Nevertheless, for the spirit they display they deserve the highest respect; moreover, as tentative measures they have their value; and they are quite in harmony with the genius of the English character, which is very slow in making any formal and authoritative movement; and, when it does so move, always travels over the prostrate forms of a large number of unauthorised efforts which have been allowed to pave the way for its passage. Whether such movement in this matter will ever take place seems at present highly improbable, and, in point of fact, very undesirable so

---

[*] Gibbon, chap. lxvi.

long as things are as they are. No 'Eirenicon' of diverse opinions, no 'Henoticon' of conflicting sects would, if possible, do any real good to Christendom at this moment. And for the future, the most hopeful idea that has been suggested yet, is that with which Mr. Ffoulkes concludes his pamphlet ('The Church's Creed or the Crown's Creed?'), namely, that "plain Christians might traverse the world with no other passport to the Sacraments of the Church in all lands than the Nicene Creed."

Something, however, may be said here as to the claims which charity imposes upon the Anglican Church, taking her as she stands towards the Age, and in reference to other Christian communions. (I.) She has duties to discharge; (II.) she enjoys peculiar advantages for discharging them; (III.) she is encouraged by the precedents which history supplies to be generous and forbearing in her discharge of them. We will consider these points in order.

It may be interesting to notice, in passing, the change which has come over our Church and people with respect to this question of drawing separate communions together. The word "toleration" was once a living and very vital word both in the Church and State of England. Before the passing of the Statute 1 William and Mary, c. 18, toleration was the *terminus ad quem* of all reformers; since then it has been their *terminus a quo*. Of course, in respect of toleration by the Government, the religious question is so steeped in politics that it does not legitimately come within the scope of our subject. At the same time it is important to remember that the topics of union and comprehension, which now receive so large a share of attention, were excluded from the field of discussion so long as toleration was sought or cherished as a political boon. In fact, purposes in this behalf have completely changed places. A single passage from Bacon's Essay, 'Of Unity in Religion,' will illustrate this. "Concerning the Means of procuring Unity; men must beware, that in the procuring or muniting of religious unity, they do not dissolve and deface the laws of charity and of human society. There be two swords amongst Christians, the spiritual and temporal; and both have their due office and place in the maintenance of religion." Here the statesman-philosopher has only one notion of the way to compass religious unity, namely, by

coercing dissenters into conformity with the State religion, either by temporal or spiritual penalties. It was against this idea that the efforts for toleration were directed. When these efforts attained success in 1689, it was really the triumph of diversity in religion over unity in religion. The triumph was a political triumph. But as soon as it was achieved, then the field was clear for thoughtful and earnest men to address themselves to the subject of evolving religious unity out of this diversity, upon high principles of forbearance, charity, and fundamental agreement in the few, deep, root-truths of Christianity. Locke wrote his first 'Letter concerning Toleration,' in 1685, and he commences it with these words: "Since you are pleased to inquire what are my thoughts about the mutual toleration of Christians in their different professions of religion, I must needs answer you freely, that I esteem that toleration to be the chief characteristical mark of the true Church." But after the Act was passed we find him, in 1692, thus expressing himself in 'A third Letter for Toleration:'—"An agreement in truths necessary to salvation, and the maintaining of charity and brotherly kindness with the diversity of opinions in other things, is that which will very well consist with Christian unity, and is all possibly to be had in this world, in such an incurable weakness and difference of men's understandings." Of course, no greater importance can be alleged, at least by a Churchman, for Locke's opinions, than what naturally attaches to those of a profound and independent thinker; but that importance is weighty for the reason that he wrote before and after the achievement of toleration, and his language reflects the change. Unity through coercion had been fought against and destroyed; thenceforward unity through comprehension was the object of desire. This was the natural progress and tendency of religious freedom. The political consequence was, that toleration lost character as soon as it found place in the Statute-book; and Nonconformists in course of time came to reason that "neither the Church, nor the Civil power, can justly pretend to exercise Toleration."*

These remarks are thrown out by the way, being not alto-

---

* See 'Hints on Toleration, in Five Essays: Suggested for the Consideration of the Right Hon. Lord Viscount Sidmouth and the Dissenters,' by Philagatharches. 1810.

gether irrelevant to the subject in hand, though off the main line of its discussion. It does not seem at first sight that the present bent of opinion among Churchmen respecting union and comprehension is in the least affected by the political battle, lost and won, to which this passing reference has been made; but a closer consideration will convince us that the ideas which are working in men's minds now, it would not have been possible seriously to entertain, so long as the political horizon was hung with these clouds.

The duties which lie at the door of the Anglican Church in this matter, are so mingled with the advantages she enjoys for discharging them, that it is scarcely possible to discuss them apart. Opportunity begets responsibility; and it is difficult to point out the latter without in the same breath indicating the former. Yet, for the sake of clearness, it is better first to insist upon the duty, and then to lay open the means at hand for fulfilling it. This we will endeavour briefly to do. There is no communion in Christendom of which it may not be said by its thoughtful and zealous adherents at the present time—"Now is the hour of its trial; now is the testing-time which shall show how much life of the Spirit of Christ dwells in it—Now will come out, if it be within, the power from on high, not only to hold truth in a firm grasp, but at the same time to hold truth out into the turbulent world to light it, and guide it, and be a blessing to it; not merely keeping truth jealously enfolded in the embrace of an exclusive and unsympathizing system, but offering it to those who seek it, with the calm, resolute, strength which comes of knowing the truth, and with the freedom which is the result of knowledge." There is no communion in Christendom to which it is so deeply a duty that this should be said as the Anglican Church. Her position in the world is such as no other section of Christianity does or can occupy. She is the Church of the most commercial of all nations, of the most progressive of all races, of the most widely scattered of all peoples. In spite of the fact that wherever she raises her standard she plants it amidst numberless sects who have split off from her, and (in a certain sense—but only in a certain sense) have renounced her communion, it is true that she alone by the admission of all, whether friend or foe, is the Church-of-England. She cannot be intelligibly spoken of, even by her

enemies, without such language being used as confesses her supremacy, and proclaims her to be the mother Church of the English-speaking race. If the Lambeth Conference had done nothing else but bring this fact home to the minds of the dwellers in the mother country, it would have done enough to justify its convention. It was well worth all its cost, to make this fact seen and felt in England; for no mere statement on paper of the extent and ramifications of the Anglican Communion could have done the same thing with the same effect; and it was needful for it to be done, and that in the most effective way. It would seem only necessary to take in and duly appreciate this fact in order at once to perceive that duty of the gravest kind, towards God and towards man, rests upon the Anglican Church.

It is her duty, then, to be the fearless and constant friend of truth; fearless in granting liberty to her members to seek truth in an orderly, reverent, and sincere spirit; fearless also in a firm repression of a licentious disposition to make a feigned love of truth an excuse for a real rebellion against Divine law and ecclesiastical rule. She must protect both truth and truth-seekers, and take care that the former is not "wounded in the house" of the latter. She must, for the discharge of this duty, be Janus-faced, looking back into the past, forward into the future: she must be Argus-eyed, taking rapid and acute notice of every circumstance with which the flow and surge of thought and life surround her; and wisely and generously accepting, appreciating, and utilising those circumstances. She must remember that her duty is not bounded by the pale of her own communion, but that it extends to all the Christian denominations beyond. Truly and eloquently has it been said by one of her most gifted and loyal sons: "When our Lord was in that ship in the tempest, which all ages have agreed in employing as a type of His Church, St. Mark alone of the Evangelists, as it were incidentally, observes,—'and there were also with Him other little ships.' Nothing more is said through the narration of these '*little* ships.' Yet they, doubtless, enjoyed a share in the blessing of calm obtained by the ship that bore Jesus Christ. I have sometimes thought that they picture vividly the fortunes of those societies that in these later ages have moved in the wake of the ancient Apostolic Church; that are

with it forced to endure the storms of a world impartially hostile to every form of religious effort; and that are not without participating in the blessings of the holy presence abiding in that Church, as long as in sincerity of heart they endeavour to keep up with the Master in His course." * If the Anglican Church keep this noble view of her relationship to other communities of Christians steadily before her, it will be her reward to gather in, and present to her Divine Head, the scattered and divided souls, who have at least this common affinity, that they seek to be saved by a knowledge of the truth.

For the discharge of this duty she enjoys special advantages. In the first place, though a reformed communion, she has not broken with the past. The Creeds, the Sacraments, the Apostolic ministry of bishops, priests, and deacons, bind her with the strength of a "threefold cord" to the first ages of the Faith, and preserve her essential unity with all that is Catholic in Christendom. She has, therefore, what may be called constitution; that is to say, the vigour of a derived life. Succession and tradition are both hers, and they combine to protect her from the extravagances and imperfections which necessarily beset all *de novo* methods of presenting the Gospel to mankind. It is, of course, quite superfluous to tell Churchmen that all this is glory and strength to the Church. But it is not superfluous to tell the Age, which is impatient of anything older than the results of its own activity, that for a religious society to be effectively the Church of the present, to be promisingly the Church of the future, it must be able to show an unbroken continuity with the Church of the past.†

Another advantage the Anglican Church possesses in the fact that she has not closed the door against progress by laying claim to infallibility. All such claim she implicitly renounces in Articles XIX., XX., and XXI. Finality and infallibility

---

* 'Primitive Church Principles not inconsistent with Universal Christian Sympathy.'—Archer Butler's Sermons, first series, p. 448. 6th edit.

† It is curious and instructive to observe how extremes meet in this matter of antiquity. "The day is past for appeals to antiquity." These words might have proceeded from the most advanced 'liberal' either in politics or religion. They actually are the words of Archbishop Manning, in his recently published "Pastoral" upon 'The Œcumenical Council,' (p. 10). He is yet more emphatic in his work upon 'The Temporal Mission of the Holy Ghost,' wherein he stigmatizes the appeal to antiquity as both "treason" and "heresy."

are very seductive and very dangerous illusions. They are very widely seductive; for, as regards finality, who is there that is proof against the fascination of the idea that his policy, his system, his theory, his invention has reached the *ultimum bonum* in its own particular line? Reason, it is true, would soon dispel the idea; but reason melts away under the influence of a charm so potent because so flattering to pride, so compliant with the desire for repose. And infallibility, for nearly the same reasons, exercises an equal power. The persuasion that one cannot go wrong is akin to the persuasion that one cannot go further. In a world of ceaseless change it is natural to seek relief in the unchangeable; and we may reach the idea of unchangeableness, either by assuming that there is nothing beyond to change into—which is finality; or that there is nothing better to change into—which is infallibility. Moreover, these illusions are deeply dangerous. He who claims the character of finality for anything in this life really writes upon it the record of its death. In like manner, he who claims the attribute of infallibility for any system, person, or institution, thereby offends against the law which the Almighty has imposed upon all things—the law of progress. He is attempting to dam a stream which flows by the Will of God. That Will alone is final and infallible, and only so far as we attain to the knowledge of that Will can any stability be claimed for our practices and our beliefs. The Holy Ghost is our Divine Guide in seeking to know God's Will; but the ideas of guidance and of search involve the idea of progress.

From these two advantages, which are indeed positive in their nature, though negative in the mode of stating them, there arises a third, to which cling more obviously the hopes of our Church's future. Possessing a constitution—a derived life—as a branch from the parent stem; possessing, too, the freedom to grow, unchecked by the assumption of infallibility; these two qualities in combination give to the Church a power of self-repair—the *vis medicatrix*—which enables her to recover from injuries to which the necessary conditions of her existence expose her, and which would otherwise permanently cripple her action, as a living body indwelt by the Divine Spirit. No mere desire for unity can serve in place of this self-repairing power. Protestant bodies which have broken with the past by

their rejection of the derived life, so conspicuously lack the *vis medicatrix*, that their efforts after unity only result in increased disunion.* Not, however, to enlarge upon a fact which, by its sadness, gives our separated brethren a claim upon our charitable sympathy, it is enough to remark that the Anglican Church, bewailing, as she does, year by year, "our unhappy divisions," has yet this ground of hope, that both those who revere the past and those who reach forward to the future find place, side by side, within her pale, which they can scarcely be said to do within the pale of any other communion in Christendom.

Now, it is in the possession of these advantages that the present comprehensiveness of the Anglican Church consists and that the hopes of her future capability for comprehension reside. At the same time, there is no good in shutting one's eyes to the fact that many of the Church's worthiest sons regard with suspicion the very comprehensiveness which other sons, not less worthy, hold to be a cause of rejoicing. This being so, it would certainly, as a matter of expedience, be bad statesmanship, and, as a matter of principle, bad churchmanship, to push forward from any one of the many sides which the Church presents to the Age, such attempts at comprehension as would have the effect of grieving any important section of the faithful within her bosom. The most large-hearted yearnings after union should at least be controlled by the consideration that the Church is the Church of those within, not of those without, her communion; and this fact ought to repress the thought of sacrificing, for the sake of unity, not merely any fundamental principle of Christian faith and practice (for our allegiance to God and to His truth forbids this), but even of giving way upon any really non-fundamental point, so long as it appears to a considerable number of Churchmen to be fundamental. Let everything be done through wider intercourse, more pains-taking study, more devout meditation upon primal truths, to enlighten the minds and inform the consciences of Churchmen as to what principles are, and what are not, fundamental; but let not one party within the Church

---

* See 'The Law of Creeds in Scotland,' by A. Taylor Innes: a most instructive book as bearing upon this point.

set at defiance the principles, or even the prejudices, of another party for the sake of compassing a union with some outsiders, which union, in such circumstances, must needs be transient and superficial. The familiar proverb, "Charity begins at home," is intensely significant when lifted to the level of reunion schemes and comprehension plans. And is there not reason for thinking that its wisdom has been neglected when attempts to conciliate brethren without, by means of assimilating ritual and observance, have been made at the expense of the feelings of brethren within? Is it charity so to strain after union on one side as to cause a schism to gape on the other? "Of course," it has been wisely said, "we are not such children as to suppose that the real unity of Christendom is to be secured by clergy at Rome, Constantinople, and London, wearing similarly-coloured stoles."* It is to be hoped the Archbishop is extensively correct in his assumption. At any rate, it is certain that true Christian charity, whence alone all union and comprehension can spring, is most largely possessed by minds that are supremely indifferent to, and abundantly tolerant of, the diversities which distinguish the communions of Christendom. In fact, to minds of this character unity in externals does not seem of such paramount importance; for they themselves can move freely through the world, holding firmly by the grand truths which underlie all communions. On the other hand, those types of mind, to which unity in externals appears to be of very great moment, are, unfortunately, the most retentive of prejudices which chiefly hinder the union they seek to bring about.

And as we touch upon this point of the toleration of diversities in matters of detail, it is refreshing to recollect the instances in which it has been manifested. Ecclesiastical history, alas! bears little on its pages that can afford pure satisfaction to a charitable mind; but here and there the influence of a spirit holier than the spirit of party, broader than the spirit of patriotism, loftier than the spirit of loyalty to a prescribed system, is felt—in isolated facts, indeed, but yet—in facts full of significance, if viewed in the light of the charity

---

* 'Charge to the Clergy of the Diocese of London at his Visitation, in December 1866.' By Archibald Campbell, Lord Bishop of London. P. 60.

which "beareth all things, believeth all things, hopeth all things, endureth all things." That Jews should find it hard to consort with Gentiles in the communion of the one faith they jointly professed was natural, indeed, but sad. At Antioch this repugnance would most strongly be exhibited. Yet there is more than enough to repair the mischief in the spirit of forbearing charity which it evoked in the arrangement which tradition leads us to believe was come to, namely, that S. Peter appointed Evodius bishop of the Jewish, and S. John appointed Ignatius bishop of the Gentile, believers. Of the same spirit was the toleration in the early Church of diversity of practice in the mode of the Lenten Fast, and in the time of observing Easter—a diversity which has its value in our eyes for having called forth from Irenæus the noble words:—"The difference in our fasting establishes the harmony of our faith."[*] Of the same spirit was the conduct of Alexander, Bishop of Alexandria, who accepted the baptism of children by their playmates, "on finding that the order of the Church had been closely observed; and decided that it was not necessary to rebaptize those who, in their simplicity, had been judged worthy of Divine grace."[†] Of the same spirit was the exclamation of S. Ambrose over the murdered Valentinian, who had desired, but not received, holy baptism: "If martyrs were baptized in their own blood, Valentinian was baptized by his piety and desire."[‡] The breath of the same spirit comes fragrantly across to us from the banks of the Nile, where the obscure and scanty remnant of the once great Egyptian Church offer up at their rude altars—knowing not, it is to be feared, the language they use—that magnificent "Prayer of absolution to the Father," in the Anaphora of the Coptic S. Basil, in which this beautiful passage occurs:—"Confirm in good to the end of their lives, and guard in peace . . . those that dwell at a distance, and the people of this place, men and women, old and young, small and great, them that have come, and them that have not come; those who have desired us to remember

---

[*] Eusebius, v. 24.

[†] Sozomen, ii. 17. This story, indeed, is believed by many to be untrue; but it is at least certain that its spirit was tolerated, or it would not have been told without censure; and it is especially dear to Anglicans from the use made of it by Keble, 'Lyra Innocentium,' vi. 7.

[‡] See Professor Bright's 'History of the Church: A.D. 313-451,' p. 212.

them, and those who have not desired us; them that we know, and them that we know not; them that love us, and them that hate us."* And, to pass at once to our own Church and our own Prayer-Book, the same spirit inspires the comment made in the exhortation in the Office for "Baptism of such as are of riper years," upon S. John iii. 5—"whereby ye may perceive the great necessity of this Sacrament, where it may be had." And with this we may include the rubric on "Spiritual Communion," appended to "The Communion of the Sick:" all which, indeed, is consonant with the maxim of S. Thomas, "Articulus necessitatis Sacramentum excludit."

And here we come upon an aspect of the question of comprehension which deserves a closer inspection. It has been already remarked that while charity within the Church—which is conciliation—touches the behaviour of individual Churchmen, or sets of Churchmen, to each other; charity beyond the Church—which is comprehension—concerns the attitude which the whole communion assumes towards separated bodies and the other branches of the Church Catholic. It is not, indeed, competent to any section of the Church to enter into terms of communion with other bodies, still less for any individual to relax, on his own responsibility, those conditions which the Church has plainly laid down for participation in her rites. But, granted all this, there remains a large sphere of action in which individual Churchmen may do much to hinder or to help the cause of Christian unity. What is about to be said chiefly concerns the clergy, and, of them, principally parish priests; but some remarks may affect laymen as well.

In the first place, then, let it be borne in mind that as the Church has less excuse for being intolerant than the Sects, because they, by the necessity of their position, must be more stiff in maintaining those points upon which they have chosen to separate from her; so ought Churchmen to act in this spirit of large tolerance towards the Dissenters with whom they may have to do. To this end charity of language is obviously conducive. The words "heresy" and "schism" are of far too grave an import to be used offhand; and before any one takes upon himself to apply them, he ought at least to ascertain whether he is supported in so doing by authority which he is

---

* Neale, 'Introduction to History of Holy Eastern Church,' p. 636.

bound to respect. To call a man a heretic is to call him by the hardest name which can be found in the vocabulary of theological opprobrium; then is it asking too much, for the sake of charity, that it should never be used in speaking of persons, who may indeed differ widely from ourselves in their views, yet have not formally renounced the creed of their baptism, or have not been found guilty of heresy by a competent tribunal? "The sin of schism" is a phrase which glides from the tongues of enthusiastic Churchmen with a glibness which is simply shocking, if they really believe that schism is a sin. Without questioning the fact, who, it may be asked, is the sinner? and is it quite clear that the Church, through the frowardness of her rulers in times past, has not been forced into the position of a *particeps criminis?* They who feel moved to use this sort of language will do well to call to mind the words of S. Clement of Rome,—*ἀγάπη σχίσμα οὐκ ἔχει, ἀγάπη οὐ στασιάζει, ἀγάπη πάντα ποιεῖ ἐν ὁμονοίᾳ.*[*]

Again, there is charity of interpretation. It will often fall within the experience of a Parish Priest, and it may sometimes happen to a lay Churchman, to have to interpret the Church's rules for the instruction of enquiring Nonconformists. In this, as in every case of interpreting a written law, there is a latitude, within which the interpreter may move, without either being so lax as to be unfaithful to the Church, or so stringent as to make her law repulsive and tyrannical. In any other case wisdom suggests that the interpreter should lean to that side of this permissible latitude, which is most in harmony with the original spirit and intention of the thing he is dealing with. Let this method be adopted by Churchmen in their manner of presenting the Church to the observation of Nonconformists, and the effect will not a little tend towards union and comprehension.

A careful examination of the formularies of the Church as they now stand, and an attentive study of the history of those formularies,—their origin, their developments, their modifications,—will convince an unbiassed mind that the spirit which pervades them throughout is large and comprehensive. It is, in the best sense, the spirit of compromise. The word compro-

---

[*] S. Clem. Rom. ad Corinth. xlix.

mise, we all know, enjoys an indifferent reputation with thoroughgoing partisans. With them it signifies the sacrifice of principles. But then it will generally be found that such persons dignify with the name of principles, not the great truths which the greatest number agree to hold in common, but minor points of opinion which chiefly serve to distinguish one party from another. Now, inasmuch as compromise really means the adjustment of these minor points so that coalition may take place upon the great and common truths, it unavoidably incurs blame, because the process of adjustment involves the paring down the salient characteristics—which parties are so proud of,—for the sake of bringing about unity and concord,—which parties do not care for. A very conspicuous and familiar example of the compromising spirit in our Liturgy is to be found in the words of administration of the Bread and the Cup in the Holy Communion. The First Book of Edward VI. (1549) contained only the first halves of the present forms; the Second Book of that reign (1552) prescribed only the second halves; the revised Prayer-Book of Queen Elizabeth (1559) combined the two halves into the full and well-balanced formulæ which we now possess. Thus, our Church learnt by experience, and wisely profited by the lesson, that neither the objective element alone, nor the subjective alone, is enough to satisfy the varied wants of her children; but that the union of the two not only meets all demands, but also keeps before the minds of the faithful the "whole counsel of God," which His inspired Word teaches as to the "Communion of the Body," and "the Communion of the Blood of Christ." No better instance than this can be cited for the guidance of those whose duty it may be to interpret to strangers the principles of our Church.

And now it may fairly be asked, What hopes are there of comprehension making any real progress? If we look only at things as they are, the hopes are few and faint indeed. None of the schemes that have been put forward has met with any large acceptance; and, perhaps, it is worth considering whether there be not, in the very nature of things, causes which must always frustrate a definite scheme. At any rate, there are causes in the circumstances of the times which would render such a scheme abortive now. Meanwhile, can nothing be done? It is hoped that the suggestions thrown out above help to show

that something may be done; and a few words may be added to make this clearer.

It must have often occurred to a reflective mind that if a stranger were to visit Christendom, and observe with an intelligent eye its numerous divisions, as they stand at the present time, and were to know nothing about the causes or the history of those divisions, the thought would at once strike him that the points in which they agree are much more vital than those in which they differ; and, moreover, that they themselves esteem them to be so. From this thought he would naturally pass on to speculate upon the feasibleness of their combining on the ground of those common points of agreement, and also upon the increased power with which such combination would endow their efforts. All this, of course, may be tossed aside as a dream. But is there not something like it in the experience of Christian missionaries in heathen lands? We know only too well, that party spirit and religious contention make their hateful way into missions, reproducing, less excusably and more disastrously, the wretched divisions which disgrace us at home. But it is also a fact that different communions of Christians do coalesce, and fraternise, and take joint action in the common work of evangelization, in a way which, at home, they would hardly venture upon. The examples of this are not, it is to be regretted, so many or so marked as they easily might be; but such and so many as they are, they seem to contribute something to the solution of the great problem of comprehension. A ray of hope shines upon the home Church from her distant missions.

But at home even, there is some hope to be got out of the facts of Non-conformity. Large and important as the proportions of Non-conformity to the Anglican Church confessedly are, a consideration of what elements non-conformity is composed of will show that they contain the possibility of comprehension. It is generally admitted that Nonconformist bodies are continually fluctuating as to their members. Dissent is not to any considerable extent hereditary. Three generations exhaust the pedigree of most dissenting families. In other words, these bodies largely consist of individuals who have seceded from the Church for reasons mostly personal to themselves, and which consequently do not bear being handed down from father to son;

and when the reasons have lost every spark of vitality which regard for friends, dislike of change, and similar influences may cherish in them, the return to the Church becomes natural and easy. Looked at, then, from the side of the Church, there is seen to be an efflux from her communion of members, who for a variety of reasons (many of them, alas! discreditable to Churchmen, and amongst them the most frequent and most discreditable is the exclusive and selfish behaviour of seat-holders in our churches) have grown discontented with her, or, at least, with the administration of her system by those in authority. There is also seen to be an influx from the various dissenting bodies, of individuals, who have lost interest in the causes which led them, or their ancestors, to secede, or have deliberately come to the conclusion that the Church is "the more excellent way." This being so, there is surely plenty of scope for exercising practical comprehension. In the first place, it may be done by so improving the machinery of the Church system, and so easing its bearings in operation, that the minor causes, at least, may be removed, and the outflow of dissentients be checked and diminished. In the next place, let a generous and friendly attitude be assumed to those amongst Nonconformists who show any disposition to return to the Church of their fathers. Let it be distinctly avowed that, while the estrangement of religious bodies may have become intensified into practical excommunication, formal excommunication alone excludes from the rites of the Church. The attitude of the Church towards the sects is very different from that of the sects towards the Church. They may be angry with her, but she is not angry with them: they have left her, she has not forsaken them. And if this fact were only acted out in the arrangements of our public worship, as it well might be, if churchwardens would do their duty and seat the parishioners, not merely the "man with a gold ring, in goodly apparel," the inflow of separated brethren would increase, and, in the widest and deepest sense, the Church would "hold her own."

In all that has been said it is not, of course, forgotten that there are political dissenters and theological dissenters. The causes of political dissent the Church cannot remove, but they may be removed for her, and even against her will. The causes

of theological dissent can be dealt with only by persuasive reasoning, and the rectification of the boundaries of religious thought. But besides these two classes of dissenters there is a large mixed class of dissatisfied persons, whose reasons for frequenting the meeting-house go no higher than the mismanagement of their own parish church. No institution, indeed, can meet all conscientious scruples, or allay all captious grumblings; but after making allowance for many "little ships" being freighted with irreconcilable dissentients, there is a vast amount of work to be done by the Church in winning back genuine "dissenters against their will."

In bringing these remarks to a close, I would resort to that similitude of the Church which all ages have consented to employ: "Walk about Zion, and go round about her: tell the towers thereof. Mark ye well her bulwarks, consider her palaces; that ye may tell it to the generations following." The towers of our Zion rise not less majestically now than in the days when her power was felt, and bowed down to, by the powers of the world. Her proud title, "Civitas Dei," is more truly hers now than when it was most readily accorded to her by the "Civitas mundi." The sphere of her dominion is now exclusively the consciences of men; it is no longer their interests or their fears. But the transition from external authority to internal influence makes it necessary that her citizens should go carefully over her ancient strongholds. "Tell the towers thereof;"—count up thankfully those points of vantage in her system, from which skilful and vigilant watchmen may observe the progress of mankind, and cause her gates to be opened for the admission of whatsoever of goodness and truth that progress may develop. "Mark ye well her bulwarks;"—take careful notice that they are in sound condition, and do the right kind of service; that they are defences against sin, and error, and dishonest paltering with holy truths; not restraints on conscience, or obstacles to the advance of earnest minds. "Consider her palaces;"—see to it that within her ample limits there are safe abodes for all who claim the boon of her citizenship; "many mansions" suited to many wants, varying as the dwellers vary, but all subdued to the essential harmony of the "Father's house." If the citizens of our "Holy City,"—the Anglican

Church,—do wisely and well all that these suggestions venture to point out to them; if they so cultivate the spirit of charity that she shall be known of all to be "a city that is at unity in itself;" if they stretch forth loving hands to those beyond her gates, and lead them in with the gladness of the angels, who rejoice over every returning wanderer, not with the mean exultation of partisans over a recruit to the ranks of a sect; then the Church need not fear to face the Age, and her children will have something that they may be proud to "tell to the generations following."

ARCHIBALD WEIR.

LONDON: PRINTED BY WILLIAM CLOWES AND SONS, STAMFORD STREET,
AND CHARING CROSS.

THE HECKMAN BINDERY INC.
BOUND TO PLEASE
JULY 75
N. MANCHESTER,
INDIANA